A GOLDEN CHAINE OF TIME LEADING UNTO CHRIST.

OR,

A Compend of Sacred History,

wherein the principall Periods of Time, from the Creation of the World to the death of Christ are included, and above threescore questions of great importance resolved.

By M *William Nisbet* Minister of Torboltoun in the Presbytery of Aire, and published by Act of the last General Assembly.

In morte & vitâ lucrum est mihi Christus Iesus,
Morte sua vitam qui mihi restituit.

Printed at EDINBURGH by the Heires of GEORGE ANDERSON, for the Company of Stationers. *Anno* 1650.

FOR MY VERY

HONOURABLE GOOD LORD:

JOHN

Earle of Loudoun, Lord Machlein and Tarrinzean, Lord High Chancellour of SCOTLAND.

My Noble LORD,

IT may seeme strange to your Lordship, that I, who thir diverse bygone years have been labouring under great infirmitie of body, and now of age near seventy, should become a wryter of books: It is not unknown to your Lordship, that in the famous

mous Assemblie of this Kirk holden at *Glasgow* in the year one thousand six hundred and thritie eight (where your Lordship was present, and a chief instrument of the Work of Reformation) amongst other lawdable Acts, this was one, that unto all who were to enter in the Ministry, amongst other qualifications, the knowledge of Sacred Historie and Chronologie was necessar, this made me for a time more seriously to follow that studie, wherein I had taken some paines in my youth: And having shortly drawn up in write the following Treatise, some Brethren (after they had perused the same) were desirous that I would cause publish the same in Print, for the common benefite of others, especially young Students in Theologie to whom it might be very usefull: But being conscious to my self of my inabilities in this learned age, which aboundeth with varietie of excellent gifts, I keeped the same by mee neer these ten or eleven years bygone; Remembring the advise of one who saith *Decimumque prematur in annum.* At length, I was urged by a very worthy Brother

ther to ſuffer the ſame to bee reviſed by the laſt Generall Aſſembly, whereby I found encouragement by their Act, ordaining it to bee publiſhed: And now, ſince it is to come to the view of the World, I have made bold to preſent the ſame under your Lordſhips Patrocinie, having full experience of your Lordſhips pietie and learning to diſcerne in matters of this kinde. neither is there any other whoſe name could bring more credit to my poor labours, and of whom I and mine have received ſo many favours, As your Lordſhips ſelf, whom it hath pleaſed GOD to ſet at the helme of this Kingdome in ſo turbulent a time, wherein your Lordſhip hath continued faithfull diſcharging your duetie thoſe many years bypaſt, and I wiſh may continue many more. And laſtly, your Lordſhip hath not only, in a ſingular maner, oblidged me and many others of my calling: but alſo this whole Nation, by reaſon ye have adventured oftner nor once, your Life, Honour and Eſtate for the priviledges of this Kirk, and Liberties of this diſtreſſed Kingdome. As your Lord-

ſhip hath been forward to honour GOD, according to his promiſe, hee both hath honoured, and ſhall honour you and yours. The LORD make you faithfull to the end that ye may receive the Crowne of Life: This praying for the continued happineſſe of your Lordſhips ſelf and Noble family. I remaine,

Your Lordſhips ſervant
in Ieſus Chriſt,
WILLIAM NISBET.

To

To the Reader.

THere are foure Wayes especially, whereby we are led unto CHRIST, in the books of the Old and New Testament. The first is, the most certain and undoubted Propheſies beginning in Paradiſe, and going on in a conſtant courſe toward the foreſaid mark.

The ſecond is, the manifold Ceremonies, Types and Figures directing us unto Chriſt, who is the Verity in whom they were accompliſhed.

The third is, the line of Chriſts Progenitors, derived from Adam, in a continuall and uninterrupted deſcent, almoſt for the ſpace of 4000. years, the like whereof, is not to be found of any one man, in any hiſtory of the World, no not for the half of that ſpace of time.

The ſame is alſo ſo much the more marvellous, by reaſon, that not onely Chriſts Anteceſſors, but alſo the whole Nation of the Jews of whom he deſcended, were toſſed, almoſt continually, with ſo many great tempeſts of troubles, as We may find recorded both in the Scriptures, and Apocriph books, and other Hiſtories.

The fourth Way whereby we are led unto Chriſt, is, the continued courſe of times ſucceſſively going on, and marked in Scripture, from the creation unto the

the last Article of our Saviours death, in the which, every thing is so orderly and carefully set down, as is admirable: Those foure, like the four Rivers that Watered Paradise; ever running till they were at the sea, Being deduced all from one head, never stay, till they bring their follower to Mount Calvary, where Christ was crucified. One giveth this direction unto him who knoweth not the way to the Sea, to follow a River, and then assuredly he shall come to it: Even so, he who would be at Christ, let him follow one of those, or rather all of them, and then he cannot possibly be disappointed of his purpose. Adde unto the former, our Saviours great Miracles that he wrought, and his powerfull preaching set down in the New Testament, And I am sure, that there is neither Jew nor Gentile but must be convinced in his conscience of the truth, unlesse that willfully, and of set purpose, he close his eyes from beholding the light.

The Studie of Chronologie, till of late, hath been either much contemned by some, or then but meanly regarded by others: he who Will give himself thereto, shall find it both pleasant and profitable. What more delightfull and profitable studie can there be, nor that whereby the time and manner of the Creation of the World, and of mankinde is known, the invention of Arts and Sciences, the distinction of the Kirk of GOD from the wicked: the diverse cases and estates of the same, and of Gods Worship: the originall and propagation of the chief Nations,

What

what commerce and dealing they had with the Kirk of GOD, their rising and falling, the erecting of the four Monarchies, and their decay, and the path way leading to salvation through Christ? unto the knowledge of all those, and many other memorable things, we are helped by Chronologie: For this cause the wise Divine Providence hath appointed a two-fold meanes, whereby we may understand the measure of times, the one is the Lights that are in the Firmament, which God hath ordained, to divide the day from the night, and to be for signes, and for seasons, and for dayes, and for yeares, Gen. 1. 14. *the other is sacred and common Histories.*

As for the first, I will set down what Paræus *hath written on* Gen. 1. *The Lord (saith he) hath set them to be measures, according to the which fleeting time may be numbered and distinguished in certain parts,* prior *and* posterior, *larger and lesse, that one time may be called present, an other bygone, and an other to come: that one time may be called a year, another a quarter, a moneth, a day, an houre, &c. Without this kinde of distinction, and this sort of numbering of the motion of the Celestiall bodies, we could not understand what time is: There would be no remembrance in man of things that hath been hitherto done, no deliberation concerning things that are to be done, no hope of things to come, and scarcely a thought of things that are present, but we should be like those who sleep, who neither know that they sleep, nor how long tyme they sleep, because they*

count not the time: or we ſhould be like infants, who knowe not their motion, life nor age.

From whence it may be judged, how neceſſar to the world the uſe of thoſe lights are, and here the ſingular Wiſedome and goodneſſe of GOD, not without reaſon, is to be praiſed, who not onely hath imprinted in the minde of man the knowledge of numbers, and the faculty of numbering: But hath alſo inſerted in the heavens, ſuch marks, Whereby man may diſcern the time, and continuance of things, and meaſure his own life according to the firſt and laſt, the bygone, preſent, and time to come, and may be judge, by what intervall of time one thing is diſtant from another, even as the meaſure of cloath is not diſcerned what it is, ſo long as it is unfolded, till it be meaſured by the line, and divided in certain parts. To this end appertaineth the doctrine of the heavenly motions: For the lights, by the motions that GOD hath put in them, determine time. This far Pareus. *To the ſame purpoſe ſpeaketh* Melanchton *in the beginning of the firſt book upon* Carions *Chronicle. To the ſame intent ſerveth the knowledge of Hiſtory, both ſacred and common: Of both the former,* Cappellus *hath ſaid well in the Preface of his Hiſtory, that ſlyding time ſo draweth away it ſelf from the hands of thoſe who would grip the ſame, that it ſeemeth to leave no footſtep behinde. Nature hath put us in poſſeſſion of this ſliding and ſliddrie thing, from the which it expelleth every man whom it pleaſeth: But howbeit time be ſliddry,*

and

and man infirm, the dream of a ſhadow, a worme of the earth, a living nothing, and a creature of a day, yet GOD hath given him diverſe means whereby to draw back again fleeing Antiquitie, and lay fetters upon ſliddrie time, ſome whereof belongeth to the motion of the heavens, ſome to the Divine Law, or ordinance of men: In the heavens, we have the concurrence of the Equinoctials, and Solſtices, with the new Moons, but chiefly the courſes of the Eccliſpes both of Sun and Moon, ſeldome indeed obſerved by the Ancients, but ſo much the more earneſtly to be ſought out by us. In the Divine Law, we have the diſtribution of years by weeks, We have the courſes of the preſidency of the High Prieſts returning in a certain Circle, &c. All which things is to us of the ſame uſe, that the compaſſe looking toward the Pole is to the Mariners, the levell to the builder, the moſt fined gold to the goldſmith.

Eraſmus *of Roterodame affirmeth, that Chronologie is the ſame to the writers of Hiſtories and other books, that lights are to houſes in the which we dwell, and the Polſtar to Mariners in the vaſt ſea, and that ſame that* Ariadneis *threed was to* Theſeus *in the labyrinth. And if it be ſuch to the writers of Hiſtories, and other books, what muſt it be to the readers of them?*

It is the commendation of Hiſtory, that it is the Life of memory, the Light of verity, the Meſſenger of antiquity, and the inſtructer of the life of man.

But

But if the Periods and Arsicles of time be not marked in Hiſtory, It will produce the former effects but very weakly and unperfectly. Some proof whereof Philip Melanchton *giveth in the perſon of* Philip Palſgrave *of Rhene. He relateth that oftentimes he heard* Capino *reporting, when* Dalburgh *Biſhop of Wormes,* Rudolphus Agricola, *and himſelf, not onely in familiar conferences, but alſo in conſultations anent the eſtate of the commonwealth, did often produce notable examples from the Perſians, Greeks, or Romans, that the prince was greatly incenſed with the deſire of the knowledge of Hiſtories, but he affirmed that he perceived, there was a great neceſſitie of the diſtinction of times, nations and Empires, and for that cauſe he deſired, that out of all antiquities, ſo far as was known, they would out of the Hebrew fountaines, and Greek and Latine writers, orderly draw up the ſtate of the Monarchies, that he might in his time comprehend the times of the world, and the courſe of the greateſt changes that in former time had been therein, Hereby it appeareth, that this Prince did well perceive how bare and barren Hiſtorie was, being deſtitute of Chronologie: For this cauſe, the late writers of Hiſtories have been very carefull to mark the diſtances of time, and of late, many learned men of ſingular note have given themſelves to this ſtudie, being much delighted therewith.* Joſeph Scaliger, *a man no leſſe, but rather much more famous for learning, nor for his Noble deſcent, ſpent much of his ſtudie*

upon

upon this ſubject, as not onely is teſtifiſed by that notable work of his of emendation of times, but alſo by diverſe others of his writs. David Pareus *telleth us, that he greatly delighted therein, and recommendeth the ſame unto Students in Theologie, as a lanterne both of ſacred and exotick Hiſtorie; in his Proeme before his Commentare upon the Epiſt. to the* Rom. *and a little after, he ſayeth, that without the ſame, Hiſtorie is as a houſe without light, or a bell without a piſtoll.*

The Author of the book of Wiſedome, reckoneth it no ſmall part of the wiſedome, that GOD had given him; to know the beginning, end and midſt of times, chap. 7. v. 18. *I need not to adde any moe teſtimonies.*

In the treatiſe following which I intended onely for my owne uſe, I have divided the time, from the Creation to our Saviours death, into ſeven leſſe Periodes. Others part them otherwiſe. Any man herein is free to uſe his owne libertie. I have followed that which I eſteemed moſt convenient.

My ſpeciall care herein, hath been, to ſet the bounds and marches of thoſe parts of time rightly, which I judge to bee a thing moſt neceſſar; and hath been intended by diverſe men of great learning, how they have performed the ſame, I leave to the judgement of others: and what hath been my part, ſhall beſt appear by comparing my labours with theirs. I have alſo ſet downe the

reſolu-

resolution of the most part of doubts of any importance in that subject, which if it shall bee found that I have performed in any one of them more clearly then of before hath been, it shall be bee a sufficient recompence to mee of my travell.

GOD Almighty calme the great tempests of troubles that are in his Kirk, that his Gospel having a more free passage, wee may the more freely goe one in his service.

Thine in the LORD.
WIL. NISBET.

Certaine

Certaine instructions for the better understanding of CHRONOLOGIE.

I.

THe round and full number is oftentimes put for an inequall number, as JUDG 11. 26. 300. years are put for 305. as is cleared in the fourth Periode.

2. There are sundry Periods of time that are not set downe in Scripture in expresse teatmes, but must be gathered by consequent. As the time of *Abrahams* sojourning in *Haran* in *Mesopotamia*. GEN. 12. The time of the people of Israels sojourning in Egypt, the space of *Joshuas* government. And sometimes conjecture must be used.

3. It is to be adverted that their are diverse beginnings of the reigne of some Kings, as of *David* who had a threefold beginning the first. 1 SAM. 16. 13. The second, 2 SAM. 2. 4 The third, 2 SAM. 5. 3. So *Cyrus* his reigne in *Persia* had one beginning, and his reigne over the monarchie and impire an other.

4. Sundry

resolution of the most part of doubts of any importance in that subject, which if it shall bee found that I have performed in any one of them more clearly then of before hath been, it shall be bee a sufficient recompence to mee of my travell.

GOD Almighty calme the great tempests of troubles that are in his Kirk, that his Gospel having a more free passage, wee may the more freely goe one in his service.

Thine in the LORD.
WIL. NISBET.

Certaine

Certaine instructions for the better understanding of CHRONOLOGIE.

1.

THe round and full number is oftentimes put for an inequall number, as JUDG 11. 26. 300. years are put for 305. as is cleared in the fourth Periode.

2. There are sundry Periods of time that are not set downe in Scripture in expresse teatmes, but must be gathered by consequent. As the time of *Abrahams* sojourning in *Haran* in *Mesopotamia*. GEN. 12. The time of the people of Israels sojourning in Egypt, the space of *Josuas* government. And sometimes conjecture must be used.

3. It is to be adverted that their are diverse beginnings of the reigne of some Kings, as of *David* who had a threefold beginning the first. 1 SAM. 16. 13. The second, 2 SAM. 2. 4 The third, 2 SAM. 5. 3. So *Cyrus* his reigne in *Persia* had one beginning, and his reigne over the monarchie and impire an other.

4. Sundry

4. Sundry in Scripture have diverſe names, as *Gideon* who was alſo called *Jerubbaall*, *Salomon*, *Jedidia*: *Uzza*, *Uzzia* or *Azaria*.

5. Some Kings did reigne conjunctly with their fathers certaine years, and then themſelves ſeverally and apart.

6. Some things are ſet down by way of anticipation in the hiſtorie, which are poſterior in time, unto the things that follow, as GEN. 12. 5. and 13. 10. Ios. 4. 19 SAM. 2. 4, 11.

7. It is to be adverted, that the Hebrews had three ſorts of reckonings. The firſt excluding both the termes, as MAT. 17. 1. and MARK 9. 2. compared with LUK. 9. 28. The ſecond is including both termes as in the former example, LUKE 9. 28 and every where. The third is excluding the one, and including the other as GEN. 2. 2. 4.

8. The Sabatticall years and Jubilies muſt bee carefully looked to in their own roomes. the neglect whereof, hath been a great cauſe of confuſion in reckoning of the Articles and Periods of time.

A GENERALL RECKONING OF THE Age of the World from the Creation of the World to the Death of CHRIST.

THere is great disagreement among Chronologues in counting of the years from the Creation of the World to the death of our Saviour.

It shall be needlesse here to set down many of their computations. Who listeth to have them, may finde above 40. in *Biblianders* tables. I will only propose a few: that it may appear how far some have strayed from the truth, and how near others have approached to the same.

The Greeks outrunne exceeding far in their calculations, and ſome of the Latines are not free of the ſame inconvenient.

Philippus Bergomenſis reckoneth from the Creation to Chriſts paſſion, 5232. years.

The author of Faſciculus Temporum, whom *Bibliander* calleth *Vernerus*, numbreth 5233.

They who come nearer to the truth in an indifferent maner holdeth about 4000. years

Arias Montanus counteth, 4084.

Junius reckoning according to the ſeverall Hiſtoricall Books of the Bible and *Daniels* Hepdomades, numbreth, 4013. *Funccius*, 3981. whom Mr. *Pont* our Countreyman followeth. *OEcolampadius*, 4008. *Bullinger*, 4004. *Gualter*, 4002. *Melanchton*, 3996. *Perkinſe*, 4000. or thereby.

Joſeph Scaliger numbreth, 3985. *Cappellus* alledgeth but without any good reaſon, that *Scaliger* cometh ſhort of the juſt number of a whole Jubile, and ſo far he exceedeth *Scaliger*. *Alſtedius* counteth 3982. *Andrew Willet* in his Hexapla upon *Daniel* 9. 3967. *Hugh Bruchton* in his conſent, 3969. which of all the reſt is the ſhorteſt number

ber, and ſo far as I can apprehend, the ſureſt account. *Pareus* exceedeth only in one year.

The years of this great Period of time are commonly reckoned by the Chronologues two wayes, that is, either by the numbers expreſſed in the Text, or by Jubilies. The firſt of thoſe is laudable & warrantable. The other is approven by *Scaliger*, *Calviſius* *Cappellus* and *Alſtedius*, and diverſe others of the beſt Chronologues of this time. It fared with me concerning this ſort of reckoning, as it did with *Lewes Bayly* the author of that truelie pious Book, called, the Practice of Piety, which hath been ſo much deſired that within thoſe not many years it is thirty three times reprinted. The author thereof having read that from the Creation to the death of Chriſt there are fourſcore and one Jubilies running on in a continuall and uninterrupted courſe from the one point to the other and joined together as it were linkes of a chain, was greatly at the firſt taken with admiration thereof, as is to be ſeen in the firſt edition of his Book: but after when he had more exactly tryed the ſame and found that it was not ſolide as it

ſeemeth, he did omit to make any mention thereof in his other Editions. In like maner at the firſt I thought well of it, but after more exact conſideration I found no ſolidity in it. Neither is there any ground for ſuch a reckoning before *Joſuas* time, where it truely beginneth. When I had aſſayed, I could neither make it out my ſelfe without marring of the Textuall numbers: neither could I perceive it to be done by any other whom I have hitherto ſeen without the ſame inconvenient. For thoſe Imaginary Jubilies, of the World as they call them, cannot directly jump with the Moyſaicall Jubilies without a manifeſt marring of the years of the juſt age of the World.

The time from the Creation to the death of Chriſt may be divided in ſeven leſſer Periods. The firſt is from the Creation to the Flood of *Noah*, 1656. years to be reckoned by the ages of the firſt ten Patriarches, Gen. 5.

The ſecond is from the Flood to the firſt promiſe made to *Abraham*, 407. years reckoned by the ages of the next ten Patriarchs.

The third is from the former Promiſe to the

the Peoples coming out of *Egypt*,430. years expreſly ſet down, Exod. 12. 40, 41.

The fourth Period is from the *Egyptian* delivery to the building of the Temple,480. years, 1 King. 6. 1.

The fifth is from the founding of the Temple to the deſtruction thereof and the *Babyloniſh* Captivity, 427. years, to bee collected by the lives of the Kings of *Judah*. And from Ezech. c. 4. 4, 5.

The ſixt is the time of Captivity, 70. years, Jerem. 25. and 29. 10.

The ſeventh is the ſpace from thence to the death of Chriſt, 490. years, which are *Daniels*,70. weeks mentioned, Dan. 9. 24. In ſum, 3960. years, unto the which if ye adde 40. years, from the death of our Saviour to the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* there ariſeth the juſt count of 4000. years, the which number it appeareth that ſundry by their calculations have intended to make out at the death of Chriſt, but in effect is accompliſhed at *Jeruſalems* overthrow.

For the better underſtanding of the premiſſes, two things are to be diſcuſſed. 1. What ſort of year was uſed by the Patri-

arches and ancient *Hebrews*. 2. At what time of the year the World was created. As the wise Creator of all things at the beginning did set down unto *Adam* and the rest of the Patriarchs, dayes, weeks, and Sabbaths, and taught the number of the years from the Creation downward to the time of *Moses*, even so it is not to be doubted, that they had also a certain kind and form of moneths and years, which they used in their numbring, without the which it is not possible that they could reckon either the age of the World or their own in a right maner. The year used by the ancient *Hebrews* consisted of twelve moneths, as is evident, 1 Kin. 4. 7. where *Solomons* twelve Officers are mentioned, who provided victuals for the Kings houshold, each man had a moneth in the year. The like is 1 Chron. 27. 1, *&c.* in the courses of the Princes that served King *David*. Those moneths were not lunary consisting of an inequall keeping an equall number, to wit, 30. dayes, as may be gathered out of the history of the Diluge, Gen. 7. v. 11, 12, 13. where it is said that in the 17. day of the second moneth were all

all the fountaines of the great deep broken up: and v. 13. in the selfsame day *Noah &c.* entered into the Ark, and v. 24. the waters prevailed upon the face of the earth an hundred and fiftie dayes. And Chap. 8. v. 3. after the end of the 150. dayes, the waters abated: And v. 4. in the seventh moneth, in the seventeinth day of the moneth the Ark rested upon the mountains of Ararat. So these former 150. dayes being divided in five parts betwixt the 17. day of the second moneth: and the 17. day of the seventh were just five moneths consisteth of equall dayes. unto these 12. moneths were added at the end of the year, five epact dayes, which did make out in whole, 365. dayes, which forme of year is most simple, comely, and most ancient, and was used by the *Egyptians*, *Chaldeans*, and *Armenians*, and all the other Eastern Nations, as is declared by *Scaliger* in his third and fourth Books of emendation of times.

The difference betwixt this sort of yeare and the Julian year, is, that the Julian year exceedeth the other six houres, that is in the space of four yeares, 24. houres, which maketh

keth out a naturall day. And every fourth year is intercalled in February, to wit, ſix dayes before the Kalends of March: and that ſixth day being twice numbred maketh that year to be called the Biſſextile yeare. And by this account, 1461. Patriarchall years of the *Hebrews* equalleth 1460. *Julian* yeares. This forme of intercalation was not uſed by the *Jewes* till after the captivity: and then they intercalled not one day in four years, as did the *Egyptians* and *Romans* but a whole moneth of 30. dayes at the end of an hundreth and twenty years, which is made out by adding a day for every foure years. Their intercalary moneths were eſtimate of them as but a minute of time: and in their civile computations had no uſe: neither did their Civile Judicatories judge at that time, as *Scaliger* declareth in his 3. Book of Iſagogick Canones. The intercaled moneth was placed before Adar, which is the *Hebrews* laſt moneth, and was called Veadar.

The diſtinctions and differences of times in the Scripture are not counted by the Julian, but by the Patriarchall year: howbeit the

the computation by the Julian year be customarly used almost through all Nations in *Europe* and *Asia*: and where ever Christian Religion is professed. But through long experience and more perfite skill in Astronomy it is found that the Julian year exceedeth the just course of the Sun yearly almost the fifth part of ane houre. Therefore 136. Astronomick years exceed so many *Hebrew* and *Egyptian* years 33. dayes, and are lesse then so many Julian years the space of one day, and almost the third part of an hour.

The *Jews* forme of reckoning was that they counted their feasts, the reigne of their Kings, their contracts, bonds and obligations from Abib or Nisan which was their first moneth, and from Tishri answering to our September, they reckoned the seventh of the resting of their land, and their Jubilies time of setting their servants at liberty and relieving rheir morgaged lands.

The next thing to be spoken of is the season of the year in which the World was created: anent the which there is great difference among Chronologues, some holding that

that the World was created at the Vernall Equinox when the Sun entereth into Aries, others again that the Creation was at the Autumnall Equinox, when the Sun entreth into Libra.

Scaliger differeth in this from himself: for first he maintained that the Creation began at the Vernall Equinox, but thereafter he altered his minde, affirming that the same was in Autumne. But his first opinion is followed by the most part, and most approven by the Learned: and that not without reason.

For in the Spring time the year naturally is renued, the Sun ascendeth, the day lengtheth, the night shortneth, the air cleareth, the herbs and trees begin to grow again, the bodies of men become more healthful: And finally Heaven and Earth seem then to revive, and to take a new life again. And in the Eastern parts of the World, as in *Judea* it self the Harvest beginneth, the corns and fruits of the ground come to maturity in the Spring time, Josh. 3. 15. 1 Chron. 12. 15 And in *Egypt* the Harvest endeth in May.

The renewing of the World after the Deludge

ludge was a ſort of new Creation, and the ſame began on the firſt day of the firſt moneth, Gen. 8. v. 13.

But againſt this it will be objected that this firſt Moneth was not Niſan, but Tiſhri in Autumne. Anſwer. There are many places in the Old Teſtament in the which Niſan is called the firſt Moneth, as Exo. 12. 18. Lev. 23. 5. *&c.* But Tiſhri no where is called the firſt Moneth.

Hereby it is alſo verifyed that in *Noahs* time Niſan and not Tiſhri was the firſt moneth. For in the next moneth preceeding, which was the twelfth moneth *Noah* ſent out a dove, which returned to him with the leaf of an olive pluckt off in her mouth: But in thoſe parts where the harveſt is ſo early, there can be no leaves of trees in September or October, for then all would bee faded. But it will perhaps be replyed that the Olive Tree holdeth green through all the Moneths in the year. This indeed I doe not deny: But then I ſay that the waters prevailing upon the face of the earth an hundreth and fifety dayes, it could not be that any trees could keep their leaves but muſt

be

be ſpoiled thereof, and the Olive tree then putting forth her buds evidenceth that it was the Spring ſeaſon in the which the waters decreaſed and the Dove was ſent forth by *Noah*.

It is further objected from Exod. 12. 2. where it is ſaid that this Moneth, to wit, Niſan ſhall be unto you the beginning of Moneths: and it ſhall be the firſt Moneth of the year unto you. Out of thoſe words they gather, that before, that Moneth was not the firſt in the yea r but Tiſhri.

Anſwer. It is an evil collection: for it can no more follow therefrom, that Niſan was not the beginning of the year, then it can follow from Exodus. 20. Verſ. 8, 9. That there was no Sabbath keeped before: becauſe, there the Commandement is to keep the Sabbath day holy: or that there might be no labour upon ſix dayes of the week before: by reaſon that it is there ſaid, *Six dayes ſhalt thou labour*, &c. Or that the fleſh of beaſts and fowls might not have been eaten before: becauſe that Gen. 9. 3. it is ſaid, every living thing that moveth ſhal be meat for you: Even as the green hearb have I given you all things. The

The truth is that the Lord injoineth his people the juſt forme of the year, which being in *Egypt* they had intermitted and preſcriveth no new forme unto them, but that which had been before uſed of old by their Predeceſſors from the beginning of the World.

The *Egyptians* did begin their year near to the Sommer ſolſtice: at the which time the Flood Nilus began to overflow their land, whereby it became fertile. For the which cauſe Nilus was adored by them as a God. And the people of Iſrael are diſcharged of this ſort of reckoning of the year, and reduce it to the ancient forme being now ſet free from the Egyptian bondage.

Of this minde are *Julius Ceſar Scaliger* exercit. 257. *Calvine* on Gen. 7. 8. *Junius* on Exod. 12. The *Chaldeans* alſo of whom the *Jews* deſcended, and the *Perſians* did ſo account of this as a thing received from hand to hand from their firſt Fathers as *Junius* relateth upon Exod. 12.

Cappellus holdeth that the world was created in the moneth of Aprile, and at the Equinox the one and twenty day thereof being

being the fourth day of the week the Sun entered in the first degree of Aries. The which if it be true, then the Equinoxes are turned back from the Creation to this time, wherein the Equinox falleth upon the tenth of March fourty two dayes, and the revolution of the Solsticeis is no lesse.

The first Period.

THe first Periode from the Creation to the Flood containeth 1656. years. The fixing of the marches of this Periode is so clear that it cannot with any reason be controlled. The reckoning is made out this way by the ages of the first ten Patriarches, according to their generations, as they are set downe, Gen. 5. and Chap. 7. v. 11,

From the Creation of *Adam* to the birth of *Seth*, ——— 130. years.
From *Seth* to the nativity of *Enos*, 105.
From *Enos* to *Cainan*, ——— 90.
From *Cainan* to *Mahalaleel*, —— 70.
From *Mahalaleel* to *Jered*, —— 65.
From *Jered* to *Enoch*, ——— 162.
From *Enoch* to *Methusalem*, —— 65.
From *Methusalem* to *Lamech*, —— 87.

From

From *Lamech* to *Noah*, ——— 82.
From the birth of *Noah* to the Flood, 600. years, which maketh out the former account.

The order of the Creation was after this maner.

The Common Masse of Earth and Water was first Created, destitute of externall form and that in the night, Gen. 1. v. 2. As is acknowledged by *Junius* and *Pareus* on *Gen.* 1. and *Cappellus* Observation 6. on the Creation: and *Amesius* Theol. l. 2. c. 15.

And yet this is opposed by *John Wemes* of *Lasboker* writing upon the fourth Command, Exercit. 2. He alleadgeth that the light was first created, and that the naturall day should begin thereat. For probation whereof he useth two reasons, 1. That darknesse (saith he) which was upon the face of the earth, made not the first night, it was no part of time, but a point of time for time is the measure of motion, and it began with the light, and shall end with it.

But contrare to this the Text saith: The Evening and the Morning was the first day, Even as it saith the Evening and Morning

was

was the ſecond, third and fourth day. Therefore the darkneſſe which preceeded the firſt day was night, as in the reſt of the daies following. Otherwiſe the firſt day had not been a day of 24. houres, As the reſt of the dayes were thereafter. So the marches of the Sabbath, Levit. 23. 32. are not from morning to morning, but from evening to evening.

Again whereas it is ſaid that time is the meaſure of motion and began with the light. The Maſters of the Phyſicall Science diſtinguiſh time in internall and externall. The internall time they call the duration and continuance of a thing. Externall time they call the meaſure of the motion of the firſt moveable Heaven. In the firſt ſenſe the firſt night was a part of time, and not a point of time. But not ſo in the ſecond ſenſe. Neither was the firſt light it ſelf a part of time in any other ſenſe: for the firſt moveable Heaven was not created till the ſecond day, therefore till then the motion of it could not be meaſured with time.

Secondly, he objecteth that the night is a privation of the light, and the habite goeth alwayes

alwayes before the privation. This reaſon is als valide againſt the night of the ſecond, third and fourth dayes, as it is againſt the firſt: And ſince it is not effectuall againſt thoſe, neither can it be effectuall againſt the firſt. Beſide this (whatſoever was the order of the ſucceeding time hereafter) at the creation, (the courſe whereof was altogether extraordinar) the night was the beginning of time, and not the day, howſoever, the *Iewes* thereafter alwayes did begin their naturall day at the preceeding evening, as alſo did the *Athenians*.

The order that the Lord obſerved in the Creation is marvellous, proceeding alwayes from things imperfect to things of greater perfection as may be perceived by the text it ſelf, and is alſo marked by our Divines.

There are many things memorable in this Period, beſide the Creation of the World and of Mankinde, the inſtitution of marriage, the fall of Mankinde, the Promiſe of the bleſſed Seed: the building of the firſt City by *Cain*. Gen. 4. 17. The invention of diverſe Arts by his Poſteritie, who were both ingenious and induſtrious, as the

making of Tents, keeping of Cattel and ordering of them as it ſeemeth more skilledly then *Abell* had done before. The invention of Muſick, and Muſicall inſtruments, & working with the Hamer in braſs & yron, attributed to *Tubal Cain*, from whoſe name without queſtion, the name *Vulcan* is derived.

This Periode endeth in *Noahs* time who was born in the 182. of *Lamech* his father and in the 1056. of the World. *Noah* being 500. yeares old begat *Shem* and *Cham*, from whom is the heathens *Hammon* and *Japhet* Geneſis 5, 32. From this *Japhet* commeth the Heathens *Japetus*. The queſtion is, which of theſe three was firſt begotten? Some think that *Sem* was firſt begotten, becauſe he is firſt named. But this reaſon cannot hold, becauſe the Scripture oftentimes followeth not the order of nature, but of dignitie. So *Abraham* is named before *Nahor* and *Haran*. Gen. 11 26. by reaſon of his excellencie notwithſtanding he was younger in age nor they, *Jacob* is named before *Eſau*, Malach. 1.2 And *Iſaac* before *Iſhmael*, 1 Chron. 1. 28. In like manner *Sem* is proponed becauſe of his

his dignitie. Howbeit in nature he was posterior to *Japhet*. For *Noah* in that year did not beget three sons together but successively one after another in diverse yeares. *Sem* could not be begotten in the 500 year of the *Noah*, it behoved therefore to be *Ham* or *Japhet*, *Ham* it could not be because he is called the younger son, C. 9. 24. It could not be *Sem*, because, C. 11. v. 10. *Sem* two yeares after the Flood begat *Arphaxad* in the hundreth year of his age. But if *Sem* had been begotten in the 500. year of his fathers age. He himself had begotten *Arphaxad* not in the 100. but in the 102. year whereby it is evident that *Sem* was borne not in the 100. but in the 102. year of *Noahs* age.

Observe Gen. 5. 32. an anticipation in the text for if *Noah* begat his children in the 500. year of his age, then the History of the sixth Chapter did preceed by the space of 20. years as is manifest by the third verse where the Lord sheweth that he will spare the world for the space of 120. years.

In the 480 year of *Noah* the Lord declared unto him that he would destroy the

world, and therefore commanded him to prepare an Arke for his own safety, and those who were of his Family. In the 600 year of *Noahs* age in the second moneth upon the 17. day thereof, he entered into the Arke, for that same day, were all the fountains of the great deep broken up; and the windows of Heaven were opened.

In the 601. year of *Noah*, in the first day of the moneth, the waters were dryed up from off the earth, And on the second Moneth, the 27. day of the moneth the earth dryed.

Gen. 8. And *Noah* went forth of the Arke, his Wife and his Sons, and his Sons wives in the 1657. year from the Creation before the peoples going out of Egypt, 837. years before the birth of Christ, 2271. years.

Jacobus Capellus acknowledgeth this former yeare to be the 1657. year of the world, and yet he maketh it but 1552. according to the reckoning of the Julian year, and 1653. together with 57. dayes after the Egyptian account of the year. The cause which *Capellus* pretendeth for this, is for holding out of the supposed Sabbaticall years

years and Jubilies of the world. But as this ſort of ſupputation is needleſſe: Even ſo it can never be performed without a manifeſt diminution of the numbers contained in the Text, as alſo the numbering by the Julian year is heterogeneus from Scripture neither can it ſerve his purpoſe.

The Second Period.

AT the former 1657. year of the World beginneth the ſecond Period, and endeth at the firſt giving of the promiſe to *Abraham* in *Ur* of the *Chaldeans* and it continueth 407. years, which are reckoned in this maner.

From the Deludge to the birth of *Arphaxad*, ——————— 2. years.
From *Arphaxad* to *Selah*, ——— 35.
From *Selah* to *Heber*, ——————— 30.
From *Heber* to *Peleg*, ——————— 34.
From *Peleg* to *Rehu*, ——————— 30.
From *Rehu* to *Serug*, ——————— 32.
From *Serug* to *Nahor*, ——————— 30.
From *Nahor* to *Terah*, ——————— 29.
From *Terahs* birth to *Abrahams*, 130.

From the birth of *Abraham* to the promise, ——————— 55. years.

The summe is 407. from the Flood to *Abrahams* removing out of *Ur* of the *Chaldeans* to *Haran* in *Mesopotamia*.

Sem begat *Arphaxad* two years after the Flood Gen. 11. 10. From this time the age of man began greatly to decay, as may be seen in the subsequent Patriarches.

Arphaxad lived 35. years, and begat *Selah*, Gen. 11. 12. *Selah* begat *Heber*, and *Heber Peleg*, in the 34. year of his age. The name signifieth Division, for in *Pelegs* daies the earth was divided, Gen 10. 25. as were also the languages at the building of Babel.

The Question is in what time of *Pelegs* age this tower and City were builded.

Cappellus and *Pareus* think that it was builded at his birth, 101. year after the Flood. But the *Jews* affirme that it was at his death, 340. years after the Flood.

Pareus in his Commentary on Gen, 11. objecteth two things against the *Jewes*. 1. That it is not likely, that all the posterity of *Noah* together with their Father did remaine in a mountaine of the East whole 340. yeares,

years, till they journeyed to the plaine of *Shinar* to dwel there, as is ſaid, Gen. 11.2. But the building of Babel and confuſion of languages followed that their tranſmigration.

This reaſon which *Pareus* bringeth, is grounded upon a great incertainty, for it is no wayes manifeſt when *Noah* and his poſterity came from the Eaſt to dwell in *Shinar*: as alſo it is uncertaine how long they dwelt there, before they began to build their City and Tower.

The ſecond reaſon which *Pareus* uſeth, is, that if Babel had been builded at the death of *Peleg*, then he had received his name not at his nativity, but at his death.

Neither is this reaſon ſufficient. *Lamech* gave his ſon a name by Prophecy, calling him *Noah*, which ſignifieth quiet or giving quietneſſe, having reſpect unto that quietneſſe which the LORD gave in his time unto the world after the Flood, Geneſ. 5. 29. And yet this did not befall at *Noahs* birth, but many hundreth years after. In like maner *Peleg* received his name from Diviſion, not becauſe the Earth was divided at his birth, but in his dayes, Gen. 10. 5. So

there

there is no neceſſity to think that Babel was builded, and the diviſion of languages before at *Pelegs* birth, but in his dayes, according as his name was given him by Prophecie.

I rather therefore aſſent unto the *Jewes* who think that Babel was builded toward the death of *Peleg*: The reaſon is, becauſe in the ſpace of 101. years after the Flood, when *Peleg* was born, there could not bee deſcended of the three ſons of *Noah* a competent number of men for the building of ſo huge a City and Tower; as may be gathered by taking the proportion both from the number of thoſe who deſcended of them, Gen. 10. and chap. 11. As alſo from the time when they did ordinarily beget their children, Gen. 11. from v. 10. till v. 17. which was not before 30. years. According to the which account, it will be found, that there could not be at that time 1500. fit for ſo great a work, whereas the Temple of *Solomon* far inferiour in quantity, had above 160000. Workmen and Overſeers for the ſpace of ſeven years, 2 Chron. 2. 2.

I Muſt here digreſſe a litle in ſetting down the Allegory betwixt *Peleg* and our SAVIOUR, which will not be altogether inacceptable unto the Reader.

1. *Pelegs* name was given unto him by Prophecy, importing what ſhould befall in the time of his life. In like maner was the Name JESUS given to CHRIST to ſignifie what he ſhould do, and what ſhould come to paſſe in His Life.

2. *Pelegs* name ſignifieth Diviſion, ſo CHRIST, Luke 12. 51. ſaith that Hee came not into the Earth to give peace, but rather diviſion.

3. *Peleg* being 30. years of age begat children, CHRIST being of the ſame age when he entred into his Miniſtry, begat children by the immortall ſeed of his word.

4. At *Pelegs* death the building of Babel was hindered: by the death of CHRIST the kingdome of ſathan was overthrown, and at his comming the four Monarchies were overturned alſo, and broken in pieces, Dan. 2. 44, 45.

5. *Peleg* ſtandeth in the midſt and maketh

a juſt diviſion betwixt *Noah* the tenth from *Adam* a man of the old World, and *Abraham* the tenth from *Noah*, unto whom the Evangelick Promiſe was ſo often renewed concerning the bleſſed Seed, ſo CHRIST ſtandeth directly in the midſt betwixt the Law and the Goſpel.

6. At *Pelegs* death there was a diviſion of of the earth, and of Languages. At Chriſts death it was given to the Apoſtles to ſpeak diverſe Languages, and thereafter the whole earth by their Preaching of the Goſpel was divided.

7. *Peleg* did ſcarcely attain to the halfe of his fathers age, So our Saviour lived not the halfe of a mans age, which is 70. years.

8. In *Pelegs* dayes there is a juſt diviſion of the time from the Creation to the death of CHRIST, for if 3960. years, which maketh out all that ſpace, be divided into two equall parts, each one of thoſe halfes will be 1980. years, the laſt year of the firſt halfe whereof, was ſixteen before the death of *Peleg*, even ſo CHRISTS Life and his death maketh a manifeſt diviſion of the preceeding times, and that which followeth

to

to the endof the world,the which ſpace,whether it ſhal equall or exceed one of the halfes of the formerPeriod, I leave to the determination of that great Palmony,the wonderful numberer, Dan. 8. 13.

After the impeding of the building of Babel followed the diviſion of Languages and Nations, among all whereof I will onely ſpeak a little of the *Chaldeans*, *Aſſyrians* and *Egyptians*, who were the Nations of any note, which did moſt meddle with the *Jewes* whereby the things that follow may be the better underſtood.

Of the Kings of Chaldea and Aſſyria mentioned in Scripture.

THe firſt King of Babel mentioned in ſcripture is *Nimrod*, Gen 10. The eldeſt ſon of *Cuſh* and Nephew to *Ham*, who ruled in Babel, and thereafter went out and builded *Ninive*, Gen. 10. 10. according to the Originall, and as the marginall diverſe reading hath in the late Engliſh tranſlation, and ſo he was the firſt Monarch both of *Chaldea* and *Aſſyria*. There is no mention of any other

other King of Babel, till *Amraphels* time Gen. 14. 1. who is called King of Shinar, for in that land Babylon was builded. Gen. 11. 2. This Dominion continued, as they report through 36. generations, till the time of *Tonoſconcolers*, otherwiſe called *Sardanapalus*, whom *Alſtedius* placeth at the yeare of the world 3059. But *Capellus* at the year 3161. at the tenth year of *Amaſia* King of Judah.

The Monarchie was divided at the death of *Sardanapalus* betwixt the *Aſſyrians* and *Medes*, and a litle after the *Babylonians* made defection from the *Medes*, So out of that Monarchy did ariſe three Principalities. He was overthrown by *Arbaces*, who thereafter governed the *Medes*.

The next King of *Aſſyria* mentioned in Scripture is *Pul*, not *Pulbelochus*, who was another overthrower of *Sardanapalus*, but a ſucceſſour of his, from whom *Menahen* the 16. King of *Iſrael* redeemed his peace with a 1000. talents of ſilver, 2 Kin. 15. 19.

Unto him ſucceeded *Tiglath-pileſer* whoſe help *Ahaz* uſed in his defence againſt his enemies, *Rezin* King of *Syria* and *Pekah* the ſon

ſonne of *Remaliah* King of *Iſrael*, 2 King. 16. 7.

Theſe two *Pul* and *Tiglath-Pileſer*, the Lord ſtirred up againſt *Iſrael*, the latter whereof carried away *Reuben*, *Gad*, and the halfe Tribe of *Manaſſe* into *Aſſur*, 2 Chro. 5. 26.

After him ſucceeded *Salmanaſſer*, not *Sargon*, as ſome erroneouſly have ſet them down. This *Salmanaſſer* in the ninth year of *Hoſea* the laſt King of *Iſrael*, overthrew *Samaria* and carried away the reſt of the ten Tribes in captivity in the fourth year of *Ezekiah*, 2 King. 18. 9. 10. about 260. years after the diviſion of the two Kingdomes, in the firſt year of *Rehoboam*. Next unto *Salmanaſſer* was *Senacherib*, who in the 14. year of *Ezekiah* King of *Iudah*, came up againſt *Iudah*, and took all the fenced cities thereof. And thereafter ſent *Rabſakeh* and others with a great hoſt againſt *Ieruſalem*, 2 King. 18. 13. He is alſo called *Sargon*, Iſa. 20. 1. compared with 2 King. 18. 17.

Unto *Senacherib* ſucceeded *Aſſeraddon* his ſon

ſon, 2Kin. 19. 37. Otherwiſe called *Oſnapar*, Ezra 4. 10.

Followed him *Berodach Baladan* who ſent letters unto *Ezekiah*, and a preſent after his ſickneſſe, 2Kin. 20. 12.

Neither is there mention of any King of Babel after him in Scripture, till *Nebuchadnezars* time, who was the great Monarch of Babel, and ſon to *Nebuchadnezar* the elder, by whom the Kings and people of *Judah* were caried away in captivity.

Next unto him were *Evilmerodah* and *Belſhatzar*, in whom ended the Babyloniſh Empyre.

Of the Kings of Egypt.

THe firſt mention that is made of the Kings of Egypt, is Gen. 12. in *Abrahams* time; when *Pharaoh* fell in conceit with *Sarah* *Abrahams* wife. It is moſt like that this Kingdome had its beginning ſoon after the Flood.

The ſecond *Pharaoh* mentioned in Scripture is he who preferred *Joſeph*, Gen. 41. *Alſtedius* ſaith that he was called *Apis* or *Serapis*

Serapis. And if this was *Serapis*, he was also called *Oziris* and *Thammuz*, Ezech. 8. 14. whom *Plutarch* calleth *Thammuz*: from whence he thinketh that *Hammon* is derived which is a stile of Jupiter.

In the time of the third *Pharaoh*, (as they say) *Jacob* came into *Egypt*. *Josephus* calleth him *Amesis* or *Amenophis*. But in Scripture it appeareth that this *Pharaoh* was no other then he who preferred *Ioseph*, and that both were one.

The fourth is he who caused the Infants to be killed, whose daughter did bring up *Moses*.

The fifth is he who sought to kill *Moses* and was called *Amenophis*. But *Arias Montanus* in his Chronologie maketh him one with the former: neither doth the Scripture dissent.

The Writers of our Chronicle report that *Gathelus* son to *Cecrops*, first King of *Attica* in *Achaia* and builder of *Athens*, took *Scota* the daughter of this *Pharaoh* to wife: and abhorring the cruelty of his father in law, did by sea come into thir western parts, and was the founder of our Scottish Nation.

The

The sixth was called *Acherres*, who vexed the People of *Israel*, and was drowned with his Army in the Red Sea. Neither is there any more mention of the Kings of *Egypt* in Scripture almost for the space of 480. years, till the time that *Solomon* took *Pharaohs* daughter to wife, 1 Kin. 3. 1.

The eighth *Pharaoh* was called *Susennes*, and in Scripture *Sesak*, to whom *Jeroboam* fled, when *Solomon* sought to kill him, 1 Kin. 11. 40. He came against *Juda* in the fifth year of *Rehoboam* with a great Army, and spoiled the Temple and the Kings house 2 Chron. 12. So *Judah* was justly punished for their late defection from God and His Worship.

The ninth *Pharaoh* is called *Sua* or *So*, whose assistance *Hosea* King of *Israel* used against *Salmanasser*, 2 Kin. 17.

Alstedius taketh *Tirhakah*, otherwise *Taracion* for the tenth, who is said to have come to make War against *Ezekiah*, Isai. 37. 9. But he was rather King of *Ethiopia*, as *Junius* and *Arrias Montanus* translateth the former place, and 2 King. 19. 9. For the word *Cush* in the Originall rather signifieth *Ethiopia* nor *Egypt*. The

The tenth *Pharaoh* was *Necho*, or *Nechao*, who being provoked by *Josia*, killed him in battell at *Megiddo*, 2 Chron. 35. 20.

The eleventh *Pharaoh*, against whom *Jeremiah* and *Ezechiel* propesied, was called *Hophra*, otherwise *Apries*, Jer. 44. Ezec. 29. c. 30, c. 31, and 32.

The last thing to be considered in this Period, is the time of *Abrahams* birth, which was in the 2008. year of the World, and in the 130. year of his father *Terahs* age, which is proven after this maner: *Terah* died in *Haran*, being 205. years of age Gen. 11. 32. *Abraham* thereafter departed out of *Haran*, being 75. years old. Gen. 12. 4. Of the which it followeth necessarly that *Abraham* was begotten in the 130. year of *Terahs* age. For he being 75. years old only at the death of his father, could not be begotten before that time, *Terah* being then 205. years.

This collection is most sure, and is maintained by *Augustine*, quest. 25. on Genes. by *Theodoret*, *Lyranus*, *Cajetan*, *Junius* and *Pareus* on Gen. 12. by *Beroaldus*, *Arias Montanus*, *Cappellus*, and *Hew Bruch-*

ton. But it is oppoſed by *Pererius* the Jeſuite, *Scaliger*, *Sethus Calviſius*, *Theobaldus*, *Menſius*, *Perkinſe*, and *Alſtedius*, who hold that *Abraham* was not begotten in the 130. but in the 70. year of *Terahs* age. Two principall Reaſons are ſet downe by *Alſtedius* in his ſeventh Chronologicall ground, moe by *Pererius* on Gen. The difference is great, for it is no leſſe then 60. years. The firſt Argument uſed by *Alſtedius* is this: *Terah* Gen. 11. 26. is ſaid to have been 70. years of age, when he begat *Abraham*, *Nahor* and *Haran*. By which words either the birth year of the three, or of two, or of one, is determined. But neither the firſt nor the ſecond, as is acknowledged, therefore the laſt. And neither the birth year of *Nahor* nor *Haran* is deſigned: becauſe in this Catalogue *Moſes* his purpoſe is to ſet down the Catalogue of the Elect Fathers, of whom CHRIST is deſcended: But ſuch is *Abraham* and not the other two. It is truly (ſaith he) to no purpoſe to know the birth of *Nahor* and *Haran*, as it ſerved to no effect to know the birth year of *Japhet* and *Cham*. The reaſon is

inſufficient

insufficient. It is true questionlesse that *Moses* intended to set down the birth of the Elect Fathers, of whom CHRIST descended. But how shall it be proven that *Moses* purposed to set down no other? Is it to no purpose to know the birth of *Nahor* and *Haran*? This is affirmed by *Alstedius*, but without any reason.

It is certainly necessar to know their birth, because of those came diverse Nations, who had commerce with the People of GOD, as of *Lot* the son of *Haran* came the *Moabites* and *Ammonites*, Gen. 19. 37. But what if CHRIST be descended from both those no lesse then from *Abraham*? Then his reason must prove weak. First then CHRIST came of *Haran* by *Sarah*. For it is acknowledged by all (for ought I know) without any contradiction that *Sarah* was the same who is called *Ischach* the daughter of *Haran*, Gen. 11. 29. *Abrahams* brother, and sister of *Lot*, vers. 31. of whom also came *Ruth* the *Moabitesse*, who is likewise one in CHRISTS Pedegree. And Gen. 24. 15. compared with Chap. 11. v. 29. *Rebeckah* the wife of *Isaac* an other in CHRISTS

line, is found to be deſcended both of *Nahor* and *Haran*.

The other reaſon uſed by *Alſtedius* is that if the birth year of *Abraham*, be not here ſet down, it is no where ſet down by *Moſes*, and ſo the Chronologie of *Moſes* ſhall bee defective.

Howbeit *Abrahams* birth year be not ſet down in expreſſe words, it is ſufficient if it be collected by neceſſar conſequent, as hath been proven by comparing *Terahs* death Gen. 11. 32. with the time of *Abrahams* removing out of *Haran* immediatly thereafter, Gen. 12. 4. He who knoweth not this to be a frequent practice in Chronology, is a great ſtranger thereto. The other Reaſons that are brought for this opinion are not of ſuch moment as to be ſtayed upon: But who liſteth ſhall finde them ſufficiently anſwered by *Pareus* writing on Gen. 11. I will only adde two Reaſons, where by the former opinion may be altogether overthrowne. 1. If *Abraham* was borne in the 70. year of *Terah*, and *Sarah* was the daughter of *Haran* his younger brother, as is univerſally acknowledged by thoſe who main-

maintain *Abraham* to be born in the 70. year of *Terah*, it will follow that *Haran* being only eight years of age did beget *Sarah*: for *Sarah* was but ten yeares younger then *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 17.

2. If *Terah* begat *Abraham* in the 70. year of his age, either he died not in the 205 but in the 145. of his age. Or then *Abraham* at the death of his father, when he left *Haran*, was not 75. but at least 135. years, both whereof, repugneth to manifest Scripture compare, Gen. 11. 32. with Gen. 12. 4

The third Periode.

THe beginning of this Periode is, when the Promise was first made with *Abraham* at his removing out of the *Ur* of *Chaldea*, & it containeth 430. years, as before was mentioned, which endeth at the peoples going out of Egypt, neither is there any question anent the end thereof. This Periode is expresly set down in Exodus 12. 40, 41 and Gal. 3. 17. But it is greatly controverted at what year of *Abrahams* age the same did begin, and either I am greatly deceived, or then not any hitherto have fallen

len upon the right year. *Junius* on Gen. 12 *Capellus* in his twofold hiſtorie, at the year of the world, 2073. and *Beza* on Act. 7. 6. begin the ſame at the 70. yeare of *Abrahams* age, at the which time they ſuppoſe, that *Abraham* left *Ur* of the *Chaldeans*, and came to *Haran*. And they begin the 400. years mentioned, Gen. 15. and Gal. 7.6. at *Iſaacs* birth.

But what certainty is there that *Abraham* left the *Ur* of *Chaldea* in the 70. year of his age. This is but a meer conjecture, not grounded upon Scripture. *Alſtedius* therefore beginneth thoſe 430. years later by the ſpace of five years, to wit at the 75. of *Abrahams* age, when he left *Haran*, Gen. 12 4. and went into Canaan,. And he begineth the 400. years at *Iſaacs* weaning, which he thinketh to have been five years after his birth. But both thoſe are no leſſe uncertain then the other, and it is not verie likely that *Iſaac* continued five years unweaned.

Pareus finding no ſtability in the former opinions, leaveth them and ſetteth down his own different from both, he is of that mind that the beginning of the 430. years is to be ſuſpended

perided ten years further, that is till the 85. year of *Abrahams* age? At the which time the Promiſe was revealed to him in a more ſolemne manner then it had been before, Gen. 15. And whereas there are v. 13. onely 400. years mentioned, he affirmeth that the 30. years are taken away by rotundation and that the number of 400. is put for 430. But that cannot be here, for ſo groſſe and diſproportionall a rotundation is not to be found, either in the Old or New Teſtament where 30. are taken off 430. There is a rotundation in thoſe 300. years mentioned, Judg. 11. 25. of ſo great a number only five years more, which exceedeth, as is ſet down, hereafter at more length in the fourth Periode. So 1 Kings 6. 1. the time betwixt the people of Iſraels removing out of Egypt upon the 14. day of the firſt moneth, Exod. 12. is ſaid to be 480. years to the building of the Temple, but there were 17. added dayes to the ſecond day of the ſecond moneth, when the foundation of the Temple was laid.

2. In this ſelf ſame Periode there is a rotundation, but no wayes ſo groſſe as *Pareus* conceiteth

conceateth. For, Gal. 3. 17. It is ſaid that after the Covenant was confirmed with *Abraham*, the Law was given 430. yeares. Now theſe 430. years, if we ſpeak ſtrictly endeth at the peoples removing out of Egypt, Exod. 12. But the Law was given 50. dayes thereafter, Exod. 19. 1. and 16 Here there is not ſo large a rotundation but only of 50. dayes. Againe there can be no rotundation in the beginning of this Periode becauſe there is a rotundation in the end. But in no Periode through the whole Scripture is there to be found a twofold rotundation, one in the beginning, and another in the end of a Periode.

Pareus inſiſteth, and he alledgeth that the 430. yeares muſt begin at the making of the Covenant, Gen. 15. For ſaith hee the Promiſe was made before and oftentimes repeated to *Abraham*, but no Covenant to this time, and therefore it is called, Gal. 3. διαθήκη κεκυρωμένη *Fœdus confirmatum*, a confirmed Covenant, where before it was onely ἐπαγγελία, *Promiſsio*, a Promiſe.

There aroſe a hot conteſt between *Scaliger* and *Pareus* anent the ſuſpending of this Period

riod ten years further, as is to be seen in *Pareus* Commentare upon Gen. 15. 13. *Scaliger Elench.* P. 56. replyeth that διαθήκη & ἐπαγγελία signifieth both one thing. *Pareus* rejecteth this answer, but unjustly, for it is manifest to any who pleaseth to peruse the Text, Gal. 3. from v. 14. to v. 23. that the Apostle useth these words promiscuously, even speaking of that same purpose. In that place the Covenant is two times mentioned, and the same called a Promise seven or eight times. What can be a Covenant, if that be not a Covenant, Gen. 12. Where the Lord promiseth to *Abraham* to blesse him, and to make his name great, and in him to blesse all the Families of the of the earth, and upon the other part *Abraham* (howbeit no mention be made of any speach of his) really and in effect by his practise undertaketh the condition of obedience to the Lord: as the words, Heb. 11. 8. beare, where it is said, that by faith *Abraham* when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed, *&c.*

This questionlesse is not onely a Covenant,

nant, but an Evangelick Covenant, howbeit in the Text it hath not the name of a Covenant till afterwards.

But now since none of these former opinions can be taken hold of, what is to be followed?

If I might, with reverence of those learned Men, declare what I think, I would set down that which in my weak Judgement seemeth to be more sure.

First then, whereas *Pareus* suspendeth the beginning of the 430. yeares, till the 85. yeare of *Abrahams* age, at the which time the Promise was revealed, and confirmed unto him in a more solemne manner, then it had been before, questionlesse hee faileth, for he beginneth the 430. yeares where the 400. years take their beginning. My first Reason is this, If the 430. years should begin at that time, then the whole time of the sojourning of the people of Israel should not be exhausted according as is set down, Ex. 12.40. Where, by the children of *Israel* it is agreed by the best Interpreters, that synecdochically is to be understood their fathers also to wit, *Jacob Isaac* and *Abra-*

Abraham upward: and by their ſojourning in Egypt, the ſojourning of their Fathers alſo, by *Pareus* account, then not onely the ten years that before that time *Abraham* had ſojourned in the land of Canaan, ſhould be excluded, but alſo the years of his ſojourning in *Haran* before he came to the land of Canaan, after he had left *Ur* of the *Chaldeans*, which ſome take to be five years and others ten.

2. If thoſe 430. years ſhould take their beginning from the 85. yeare of *Abrahams* age when the Covenant was more ſolemnly renewed unto him, then the beginning of the 400. years ſhould fall at the 115. of *Abrahams* age, which cannot be. For every one of the large and principall Periods ſet down in Scripture from the Creation unto the death of our Saviour, and from thence alſo to Jeruſalems overthrow hath conjoined with their beginning ſome notable event, which ſeemeth to come to paſſe by the Lords wiſe diſpoſition, that we might the better keep them in memorie, as is eaſily perceived by any who will take proofe of the ſame. The ſame is verified

in

in thoſe 300. years mentioned, Judg. 11. 28. which beginneth at the peoples removall out of Egypt, and thoſe 390. dayes, every day being put for a year, Ezech. 4. 4. taking their beginning from the Schiſme or diviſion of the Kingdom of Iſrael. But there is nothing remarkable in Scripture at the 115. of *Abrahams* age, therefore as the 400. cannot begin thereat, neither can the 430. yeares beginne at the 85. of *Abrahams* age.

To the end therefore that the beginning of the 430. yeares may be rightly eſtabliſhed, the beginning of the 400. years muſt firſt be fixed, which being done, what further is needfull, but to reckon back 30. yeares, and there ſhall be found the beginning of the 430.. The 400. yeares aſſuredly have their beginning as the Text it ſelf beareth, Gen. 15. When the Covenant was renewed to *Abraham*, and confirmed to him by a ſigne.

The Lord had oftentimes renewed his Covenant unto him for confirmation of his Faith, but there is no mention of the trouble that was to befall unto his poſteritie for

for the ſpace of 400. years till this time, and leaſt that he ſhould faint at the mention of ſo longſome troubles to inſue upon his ſeed together with ſo long a delay of the performance of the Promiſe anent the Poſſeſſing them in the Land of Canaan. The Covenant is renewed more amplely and ſolemnly, then of before, ſo that betwixt this and the firſt promiſe, there interveened 30. yeares. The time of the accompliſhment hereof was a little before *Abrahams* Marriage with *Hagar Sarahs* handmaid, after that he had dwelt ten yeares in the land of Canaan, Gen. 16. 3. For that Hiſtorie is immediatly ſubjoined unto the renewing of the Promiſe c. 15. So *Abraham* was at that time fourſcore and five years old, for in his foureſcore ſix year *Iſhmael* was born unto him, Gen. 16. 16. And at the foureſcore and ſix year of *Abrahams* age incluſive beginneth the 400. yeares, And if we reckon backward 30. yeares more, it will be found that the 430. yeares have their beginning at the 55. year of *Abrahams* age excluſive and neither at the 70. nor 75. nor 85. for then the firſt Promiſe was made to him

and

and he left *Ur* of the *Chaldeans*, and came to *Haran* in *Meſopotamia* where he remained not five nor ten yeares as is commonly thought, but 20. yeares.

The time from the Creation till *Abrahams* removing out of *Chaldea* is, ——————— 2064. years
After the Flood, ——— 408. years
Before the peoples going out of Egypt, ——————— 430.
Before the building of the Temple, 910
Before the Babyloniſh captivity, 1337
Before the birth of Chriſt, —— 1863

The reſt of the leſſer parts of this Periode, followeth in this manner. In the 99 year of *Abrahams* age his name is changed to confirme him in the Promiſe. The land of Canaan is the fifth time promiſed, and Circumciſion is inſtitute. *Sarahs* name is altered: *Iſaac* is promiſed. *Abraham* and his houſhold are circumciſed, Gen. 17. 24.

The Angels are received by him, c. 18.

The whole Hiſtorie of theſe times that are contained in the 18. 19. and 20. Chapters, was accompliſhed in the 100. year of *Abrahams* age, as is manifeſt by comparing

c. 17

c. 17. v. 24. with c. 21. v. 5. *Isaac* was born unto *Abraham* in the 101. yeare of his age, Gen. 21. 5.

Ishmael mocketh *Isaac*. *Hagar* is cast out with her son, the Angel comforteth her, Gen. 21.

Abrahams Faith is proved in offering up his son *Isaac* c. 22.

Sara being ten yeares younger then *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 17. depairted this life at *Hebron*, when she had lived 127. yeares, c. 23. 1.

Neither is the whole age of any other woman in all the Scripture mentioned.

Isaac being 40. years old taketh *Rebecca* in marriage the daughter of *Bethuell* and Oye to *Nahor* brother of *Abraham* Gen. 24. 24.

Sem dieth in the 602. year of his age Gen. 11. 11. And the 152. year of *Abraham*, and of *Isaac* 52. being the tenth from him in direct line.

Jacob and *Esau* are born to *Isaac* in the 60 year of his age, and of *Abraham* 161. Gen. 25. 16.

Jacob getteth the blessing from *Esau* by

by his mothers counsell, Gen. 27. This seemeth to have come to passe, about the 138 year of *Isaacs* age.

Jacob fleeing *Esau* his brothers wrath goeth to Laban. and in the night by the way in his sleep, seeth a Ledder reaching up to Heaven, and is confirmed anent the blessing: he serveth Laban, twice seven yeares for his two wives. Gen. 29. And when he had served full 20. years, he returned to his own country. Six yeares after the birth of *Joseph*, Gen. 38. 38. and 41. in his journey he wrestleth with the Angel, and is deli vered from the furious invasion of his brother *Esau*. *Joseph* being scarcely 17. years of age is sold by his brethren to the *Ishmaelites* who thereafter carried him down to *Egypt* and sold him to Potiphar.

Isaac depairteth this life in the 180. yeare of his age, Gen. 35. 28. a year or two before *Jacobs* going down to Egypt.

Joseph being 30. yeares old, Gen. 41. 46. two yeares after the Interpretation of the Butler and Bakers dreames, is brought before P*harao*, and exponeth his Dream,

and

and forwarneth him of the 7. fertile yeares approaching, and then of the seven barren yeares succeeding. *Iacob* being compleet 130. years, went down into Egypt, Gen. 47. 9. and c. 44. 6. and 11. While as five of the barren years were yet to run.

When *Iacob* had remained 17. years in Egypt being 147. years of age, he departed this life, after that he had foretold many things anent the estate of his Posterity, and of Christ. And recommended his soul to God, Gen. 47. 28. and 49. 18.

The Lord appeared unto *Iacob* seven times, and that for the most part in a more evident manner then he had done before unto his fathers. The Lord appeared unto *Abraham* eight times. And thrice onely he spake unto *Isaac*.

Ioseph being 110. years of age dyeth c. 50. 26. at whose death endeth the Book of Genesis, and it containeth the Historie of 2369. years, which are to be reckoned after this manner.

From the Creation to the deludge 1656 years, From the deludge to the first Promise made to *Abraham*, 407. From the

Promiſe to the birth of *Iſaac* 45. From *Iſaacks* birth to *Iacobs* 60. From thence to *Iacobs* going down to Egypt, 130. which was in the 39. year of *Ioſephs* age, Gen. 45. 11. *Ioſeph* lived thereafter 71. yeares, Summa, 2369.

The time between the death of *Ioſeph* and the birth of *Moſes* is blank, and the ſcripture is ſilent of it. All others give unto this time about 60. years or thereby: and the reaſon is, becauſe they begin the time of the giving of of the Promiſe to *Abraham* and of the 430. years too late. The juſt years wanting in this obſcure time are only 44. as may be gathered by calculation. *Pareus* giveth hereto 75. becauſe he ſuſpendeth the beginning of the 430. years ten yeares above all others, but with no good warrand as already hath been ſhowen.

Chronologues place the Hiſtorie of *Iob* in this blank, and the Jewes reckon him fifth in line from *Abraham*, but *Hew Bruchton* the ſeventh. By the former account it is evident that the juſt time of the people of Iſraels abode in Egypt did not exceed 115. years. The place therefore Exod.

12.

12. 40. is well translated, The sojorning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430. years, which being expired, that self same day it came to passe that all the host of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt, v. 41. and v. 51 The very day is precisely and twice mentioned, upon the which the 430. years expired, to wit the 14 of the first moneth, upon the which both the Passeover was killed, and the children of Israel took their journey out of Egypt. From the which it must necessarily follow that the 430. years had their beginning upon the same day of the moneth that they ended, and that *Abraham* removed out of *Ur* of the *Chaldeans* upon that same day of the moneth that his posteritie took their journey out of Egypt to wit upon the 14. day of the first moneth, upon the which thereafter the Passeover was appointed to be celebrat.

Aaron the eldest son of *Amram* was born 83. and *Moses* his younger brother 80. years before the peoples going out of Egypt, as may be gathered from Exodus 7. 7. *Josua* was born 55. yeares before that

time, as may be collected from Joſ. 24. 29 *Caleb* 39, years before Joſ. 14. 7.

Moſes being 40. years old leaveth *Pharaos* court, and fleeth unto the deſart, unto *Jethro* Governour of *Midian*, who gave him *Zippora* his daughter in marriage, Exodus 2. 21.

Euſebius whom *Capellus* alſo followeth in his twofold Hiſtorie, at the year of the World, 2485. affirmeth that while as *Moſes* lurked among the *Midianites*, there periſhed four Kings of Egypt to wit, *Amenophis*, *Orus*, *Acherres*, and *Achoris* but all this time there was but one King, as is manifeſt, by comparing Exodus 2. 15. with v. 23. Where it is ſaid that in proceſſe of time, the King of Egypt died which importeth that there was no other King, but he who perſewed *Moſes*, v. 15. Neither appeareth it, that there was any other king from the birth of Moſes till this time which is alſo acknowledged by *Arr. Montanus* in his Chronologie. So this King, who ſeemeth to have been no other but *Amenophis* reigned 80. years at leaſt, which needeth not to ſeem ſtrange, ſince

Ioſeph

Joseph a little before had ruled in Egypt all that space. After *Amenophis* succeeded another *Pharao*, being called by some *Acherres*, who perished with his host in the red Sea.

The time from the Creation to the peoples removeall out of Egypt containeth 2493. *Jewish* years. Astronomick yeares, 2491. of *Julian* yeares, 2492. with eight moneths and 23 dayes.

Followeth the fourth Period.

THe fourth Period containeth 480. years expresly set down, 1 King. 6. 1. from the peoples comming out of Egypt till the laying of the foundation of the Temple in the fourth year of King *Solomons* raign.

The Lord commandeth *Moses* and *Aaron* that the moneth in the which the people came out of Egypt should be thereafter accounted the first moneth of of the yeare Exod. 12. 2. which c. 13. 4. is called Abib For before it appeareth that when the people of Israel were in Egypt, they followed the Egyptian account, beginning the year at

the ſeventh moneth, howbeit it was not ſo from the beginning.

In the tenth day of this moneth they were commanded to ſeparat a Lambe of a year old without blemiſh for the paſſeover to be killed at the evening, the 14. day of the Moneth.

In the night following at midnight all the firſt borne among the Egygtians were deſtroyed by the deſtroying Angel. And the people of Iſrael took journey out of Egypt.

In the year from the Creation, — 2494
From the Flood, —————— 836
From the birth of *Abraham*, —— 486
From the removing out of *Ur* of *Chaldea*, ———— 430
After the birth of *Moſes*, —— 81
Before the birth of Chriſt, 1434 yeares

In the third moneth after the peoples comming out of Egypt they came into the wilderneſſe of *Sinai* Exod. 19. 1. where the Ten Commandements of the Morall Law was given unto them, Exod. 20. after that *Moſes* had tarried 40. dayes, and 40. nights faſting in the Mount Deut. 9. 9.

9. Which he also did the second time when the golden calfe was made by *Aaron*, and worshipped by the people, Deut. 9. v. 18. and 25. The same was also done by him the third time, when he went up again unto the LORD into the Mount, with two tables of stone after the first were broken, Deut. 10 3. and 10.

Those three diverse times *Moses* went up unto the Lord into the Mount.

In the first day of the first moneth of the second year the tabernacle was set up Exod. 40. 17. In this moneth were those things done which are contained in the book of Leviticus.

In the beginning of this moneth *Aaron* and his four sons were set apart and consecrate for the publick Ecclesiastick Ministery, Levit. 8. Whereas before both Magistracy and Ministry were coincident in one mans person.

In the 13. of this moneth the Levites were consecrate for the service of the Tabernacle, Numb. 8. as appeareth by comparing Chap. 7. v. 78. with Chap. 9. v. 1, 2, 3. Here was the first Presbytery institute,

tute, consisting of Ministers and Elders of the people, in the which either *Moses* or *Aaron* was Moderator, and his sons Assessors, v. 13. And together with them the Elders of the People, who imposed hands upon the Levites, v. 10. For of those is that verse expounded by the best of the Hebrews, and other Interpreters. After this Presbytery had been decayed, it was renued by King *Josaphat*, 2 Chron. 19. v. 8. And thereafter by CHRIST himself under the name of the Church, Mat. 18. 17. after the first Institution. 1426. years.

Immediatly thereafter the great Synedrion, commonly called Sanedria was erected, consisting of 70. men, for ordering of the Civile Affairs, Num. 11.24. which continued till the time of *Herod* the great, who abolished the same, and in whose dayes CHRIST was born.

A litle after the Spies were sent forth to view the Land of Canaan, Numb. 13.

In the beginning of the 40. year after the Peoples coming out of Egypt, they come to the wildernesse of *Zin*, Num. 20. 1. and Deuteron. 2. 14. where they remained at *Cades*.

In

In the end of the 40. year the first day of the eleventh moneth called Schebat, answering to our January, Deuteronomie was given out by *Moses*, Deut. 1. 3.

Very shortly thereafter *Moses* dieth, being 120. years of age, Deut. 31. 2.

In the beginning of the fourteen year of the Peoples coming out of Egypt, *Joshua* sent Spies from *Shittim* to view the Land, Josh. 2.

The People passe over Jordan, Chap. 3. They are circumcised amongst the midst of their enemies, Cha. 5. Neither durst their enemies at that time assault them, as *Simeon* and *Levi* had done before to the *Sichemites*.

When they had encamped at *Gilgal*, they keeped the Passeover according to the Law upon the 14. day of the first moneth in the plain of Jericho, Chap. 5. 10.

The day thereafter they did eat of the corn of the land, and the next day the Manna ceased, Chap. 5. 11.

The whole land of Canaan on this side Jordan was conquered in six years, as may be gathered from Josh. 14. 7. and 10. by com-

comparing the Peoples firſt entring into the ſame with *Calebs* age.

The ſame was firſt promiſed to *Abraham* 476. years before this time, and now is divided by *Lot*. The time whereof is this way collected, The ſecond year after the Peoples coming out of Egypt, *Moſes* had ſent out twelve Spies to ſpy the land of Canaan, Numb. 10. 11. And amongſt the reſt *Caleb* the ſon of *Jephuneh*, who was at that time 40. years of age, as he teſtifyeth of himſelf, Joſhua 14. 7. and. 10. But now (ſaith he) the LORD hath preſerved me thoſe 45. years: and now I am 85. years of age. From whence it followeth that in the 47. year after the Peoples coming out of Egypt the land on this ſide Jordan began to be divided.

In this place it falleth orderly that wee ſhould treate of the Sabbaticall years and Jubilies: But becauſe the particular parts of this Period muſt firſt be cleared, whereby the Jubilies thereof may be orderly placed in their own rowmes, I will firſt intreat of the ſame.

And not troubling the Reader by ſetting down

down the erroneous opinion of some anent the time of *Joshuahs* Government. Only this I say that it is blank, and not expressly set down in Scripture, but must be gathered by consequent. I therefore agree with *Junius*, *Perkinse*, *Hugh Brughton*, *Willet* and *Alstedius*, who allot no more to *Joshuahs* government but 17. years. The reason is, because all the rest of 480. years before mentioned are to be found in Scriture, those 17. only excepted. The same is also proven by the three hundred years after the Peoples coming out of Egypt mentioned Judg. 11. 26.

The time of Judges taketh up 299. years.

Othniel governed 40. years, Judg. 3. 11.

Ehud to whom *Sangar* must be adjoined as appeareth by the first verse of the fourth and the fifth Chapters, governed 80. years, Chap. 3. 30.

Deborah, —— 40. —— Chap. 5. 31.

Gedeon, 40. Chap. 8. 28. In his time they say that *Orpheus* the Poet flourished, whose Poems are the most ancient of all the Ethnick Writs that are extant.

These four compleat the space of 200. years

Abi-

Abimelech governed 3. years, ch. 9. 22
Tola ——— 23. — Chap. 10. 2.
Jair, ——— 22. — Chap. 10. 3.
Jephte, ——— 6. — Chap. 12. 7.

In his time they place the Trojan Warre, and from the Hiſtory of *Iephtes* daughter it appeareth that the fable of the ſacrificing of *Iphigenia* the daughter of *Agamemnon* hath its ground, which is as if yee would ſay *Jephthigenia*.

Ibzan governed 7. years, Chap. 12. 9.
Elon ——— 10. ——— ver. 11.
Habdon, ——— 8. ——— verſe 14.
Samſon, ——— 20. — Cha. 16. 31.

Summa of the years of the Judges, 299.

Followeth the reſt of the 480.

Eli judged *Iſrael*, 40. years, 1 Sam. 14. 18.

At whoſe death the Ark was removed out of *Silo*, 1 Sam. 4. 4. After it had remained there the ſpace of 350. years, to wit, from the ſeventh year of *Ioſuah*, at the which time the People had reſt.

Samuel and *Saul* governed 40. years together, Act. 13. 21. In that place the time of *Samuels* government is comprehended within *Sauls* reigne, as before in the Judges

Sam-

Samgars time was comprehended within *Ehuds* 80. years.

David reigned 40, years, 2 Sam. 5. 5.
Adde unto those four years of *Solomons* reigne, ——————— 1 King. 6. 1.
In the fourth whereof the foundation of the Temple was laid.
And there ariseth compleat 480. years.

Followeth the Resolution of certain doubts, that rise anent some particulars in the former Period. The places 1 *King.* 6. 1. *and Acts* 13. *verses* 19. *and* 20. *reconcealed.*

IT is said 1 King. c. 6. 1. that there were 480. years from the coming out of Egypt, till the building of the Temple, and Act. 13. v. 19, 20. that from the time that the LORD divided the land unto the People of *Israel* by lot. He gave unto them Judges the space of 450 years untill *Samuel* the Prophet. But the division of the land was 46. years after the coming out of Egypt. Now if this number hold the account from the giving out of the Law to the building of the Temple will be no lesse then 580. years.

years. And ſo there are 100. years betwixt the two numbers in difference.

This doubt hath greatly vexed both Chronologues and Interpreters. For my part I acquieſce to the ſolution given by *Luther*, *Beza* and *Aretius* upon the text, Act. 13. together with *Perkinſe*, and *Capellus*, That for ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις is to be read ὡς ἔτεσι τε τριακοσίοις, thatis for 450. years 350.

There being ſo great affinitie betwixt the words in the Greek, the Tranſcriver might eaſily be miſtaken. *Beza* affirmeth that he found it written τετρακοσίοις in all his manuſcripts ſave one. And if it was τριακοσίοις in one doubtleſſe it was ſo alſo in ſome others which he had not, being agreeable unto that one which he had ſeen, ſo this anſwer (as it is conſonant to the truth) proveth the Scripture to be incorrupted.

But in the marginall Annotations of *Bezaes* lateſt tranſlation I finde that number of 450. not referred to the ſubſequent time of the Judges, but to the time preceeding of the diviſion of the land of Canaan, including the Hiſtorie of the 17. 18. and 19. verſes, and beginning the ſame at

at

at *Isaacks* birth, from the which is reckoned 400. years to the peoples removing out of Egypt. 40. in the wildernesse, and six in *Josuahs* time, before the division of the Land. But because there are in the end three yeares lesse, the full number is set down for the broken, (as the particle ως about) importeth. The fail here is, that the beginning of this Period is not rightly fixed at *Isacks* birth time. For so there wil be 15 years wanting. But theright beginning is at the renewing of the Promise to *Abram* Gen. 15. Anent the which see more in the third Periode.

2. If the yeares of the peoples oppression be added to the 299. of the government of the Judges. Such as were *Chusan*, *Jabin*, *Eglon*, *&c.* The excesse will bee more then 100. yeares, and no lesse beyond the 480. years which is the great Periode.

What is to be said to this doubt?

The answer is, that howbeit the years of the peoples oppression be severally reckoned in the Text, yet they must bee counted in with the year of the Judges, for making up the great Periode.

3. The

3. The queſtion is, when thoſe 300. years mentioned by *Jephte* Judg. 11. 28 muſt take their beginning, and when they end?

The beginning of thoſe 300. years muſt be fetched from the peoples comming out of Egypt, as appeareth by that which is ſaid in that ſame Chapter v. 18. and 18. The end muſt be fixed at the laſt of *Jairs* government. And whereas, the juſt account extendeth to five years more then 300. the round and full number is expreſſed for brevities cauſe which is a thing cuſtomable not only in Scripture but alſo in any common diſcourſe of things.

4. It is queſtioned at what time thoſe Hiſtories mentioned, Judg. 17, 18, and 19 &c. were acted.

Thoſe Hiſtories appear to have fallen out betwixt the time of *Ioſhuah* and *Othniel*, the firſt of the Judges, when there was no Judges in Iſrael, but *Chuſham Riſhatham* tyrannized over them. The reaſon why, I think that theſe things were done in the former time, is, becauſe c. 18. v. 31. It is ſaid that the Danites ſet them up the graven Image which *Mica* had made, all the while the

the house of God was in Silo, the Tabernacle was set up in Silo in Joshuahs time: and remained there all the time of the Judges. There was no anarchy before the death of Joshuah. But immediatly thereafter it followed. Now *Phineas* the son of *Eleazar* and Oye to *Aaron* was then alive. Judg. 20. 28. When that Historie of the Levits wife fell out, which is mentioned c. 19. and 20. and was hie Priest when *Chushan* oppressed Israel: For *Eleazer* his father was then dead, Jos. 24. 33. And it cannot agree with reason to think that *Phineas* lived from that time till after the death of *Sampson* 300. years, unto the which that former historie is subjoined.

5. In the eighteenth chapter, verse 30. it is said that *Jonathan* the son of *Gershom* the son of *Manasseh* and his sons were the Priests in the tribe of the Danites untill the day of the captivity of the land. Here the question is, whether or not the Babylonish captivity be here meaned? And if the Danites continued in Idolatry till then? It is not like that a whole tribe should maintain Idolatry for so many years, through the whole time

of Judges and Kings to that captivity, to wit, 850. years or thereby, since Idolatry was abolished by *Samuel*, *David*, and other good Kings, but by the captivity is meaned the time when the Ark of God was taken by the Philistines, 1.Sam. 4. 21. 22 Psal. 78. 60, 61. By the son of *Gershom* is meaned the Oye of *Gershom*: for *Manasse* was not the father but the son of *Gershom*, who was *Moses* son Exod. 2. 22. whose proneuoy was *Jonathan*. So by *Moses* posteritie Idolatry was brought in among the tribes.

Concerning the time of the historie of *Ruth*.

THe Historie of Ruth is said to have befallen in the time of the Judges, Ruth 1.1 and is most like to have been under Deboras government. For clearing of this, somewhat must be said of the age of *Boaz*, who took Ruth the moabitish in marriage, and of the time when his parents *Salmon* and *Rahab* did beget him.

When the people of Israel came into the land of Canaan, and the spyes entered *Rahabs* house, she could by all appearance be no

no younger then fifteen or sixteen years of age, neither could *Salmon* take her in marriage, being both a Canaanite and a harlot, till she was converted, which wee must think was at this time when the spyes came to her house. *Boaz* could not bee born of her after the 56. year of her age, For we may not imagine a miraculous conception or birth where the Scripture is silent of it, which should be, if *Rahab* had conceived and born *Boaz* any space after that age. Chronologues give instance of some women who even in late times have borne children the 56. year of their age, but not of any after that time.

Presupponing then that the marriage of *Salmon* and *Rahab* was in the 15. or 16. year of her age, the nativity of *Boaz* must be extended to the yondmest year that nature can reach to, The reason is, because *Boaz* being born in the 56. or 57. year of his mothers age, it will be found that those three *Boaz*, *Obed*, and *Jesse Davids* progenitours did not beget children before the 108. year of their age or thereby, which are all the odde years beyond *Abrahams* age

when he begat *Isaac*, and is indeed admirable Or if ye will say that *Rahab* was, 72. years of age at the birth of *Obed*. Then each one of them shall beget his children in the 100. year of his age. But the first is most apparent, if then *Boaz* was born in the 56. year of his mothers age, which fell in the 22. of *Othniell* the first of the Judges then there remaineth to the birth of *David* who was born in the tenth year of *Samuels* government 327. years to be equallie divided betwixt *Boaz*, *Obed*, and *Jesse*, for begetting their children, so that to each of them befall 108. years. If *Boaz* then was born in the 22. of *Othniell* the first of the Judges, he did not beget *Obed* till the 108. year of his age, which by calculation will be found to have fallen in the 10. of *Deboras* government, about the which time the Historie of Ruth was accomplished, and *Boaz* did take Ruth to wife, and begat *Obed* the father of *Jesse*, Ruth 4.

Follows a few Questions and Answer upon the first Book of Samuel.

I. Sam. 7.2. how it is said that the Arke abode 20. years in Kirjath-jearim,

since there interveined more than 40. years betwixt the death of *Eli*, after the which time it was brought to Kirjath-jearim, and the removeall thereof thereafter by King *David* to Jerusalem?

Here leaving other opinions, this I preferre, that so many years were now already expired since the first removing of the Ark to Kirjath-jearim, unto the solemn time here mentioned of the conversion and returning of the people of God from their filthy idols. So martir, *Junius*, and *Willet*.

Question 2 v. 15. of the same chapter, how *Samuel* is said to have judged Israel all the dayes of his life, seing while hee lived, *Saul* was made King?

Howbeit it be uncertain of what age *Samuel* was when he succeeded unto Eli in the government, as also what was his full age when he dyed, yet it is evident that at least he judged Israel 20. years: for in his time, the Ark had continued so long in Kirjath-jearim before. v. 2. and that *Saul* was soon after anointed to be King, after the which time *Samuel* lived diverse years, and altogether did not give over

the government of the people, but continually watched over them, to direct them in the wayes of the Lord; and therefore *Saul* and *Samuel* are joined together, chap. 11. v. 7. Whosoever commeth not after *Saul* and *Samuel* so shall his oxen be served, Herefore also it is that Act 13. 21. fourty years are given to *Saul* and *Samuel* jointly, as having one common and joint administration in the Kingdom. So *Junius*, and *Willet*.

Chap. 13. v. 1. How Saul is said to have been one year in his Kingdom?

Diverse solutions of this question are given by *Willet* in his Hexapla upon the books of *Samuell*, the best whereof is, that *Saul* was now in his first year, while those things were done which are here mentioned in this and the former two chapters. *Junius*, *Willet*.

Quest. 2. v. 1. How *Saul* is said to have reigned over Israel two years?

Willet setteth down diverse answers to this question, but the best is given by *Junius*, averring that *Saul* reigned only two years lawfully, while as he was not yet altogether

together rejected of God, and destitute of his Spirit. See hereafter, chap. 16. 14. For then he was rejected, whileas in the expedition against the *Amalekites*, he did not obey the voice of the Lord, hereafter chapter 15. and deprived of the Spirit, when *David* was anointed, ch. 16. v. 14. This interpretation is confirmed, first, from chap. 14. v. 47. where it is said that *Saul* took the Kingdome over Israel, That is tyrannously occupyed the same. The same is confirmed by his many warres, which there are mentioned. Thirdly by his long and many persecutions against *David*. Lastly by the time when *David* with his men remained in exile at Zicklag, chap. 27 v. 7

Followeth concerning the Jubilies.

THe next thing that we must speak of, is the Jubilies, There is but one Jubilie text in all the Scripture, to wit, Lev. 25. Some of the Hebrews derive the word from the Arabick jobel, which they affirme to signifie a rams horn, because that in the tenth day of the seventh moneth called Tishrie

rie, being the day of expiation, upon the which the high prieſt entered the moſt holy place, intimation was made of the beginning jubilie, through all the land, by the ſound of rames hornes. Others reject this derivation, affirming that jabel ſignifieth not a rames horne, whereof the cornets that ſounded at that time, were made: but that it hath the name from carrying, or leading along, Job 10. 19. Pſal. 60. 11. whereupon Jubal is a ſtream, or water courſe that runneth along, and carrieth things with it. Jer. 17. 8. ſo the Jubilies like a water ſtream carry a man to Chriſt.

1. It is greatly queſtioned anent the Jubilies, how many years each one of them containeth. Againſt the Jubilies of 49. it is objected out of Levit. 25. 10, 11, 12. that the 50 year is four diverſe times called the Jubilie. *Fac. Cappellus* in his two fold Hiſtorie, at the year 1549. anſwereth that the 50. year is called the Jubilie, becauſe there are 50. years betwixt every two Jubilies, both the termes being included.

In like manner the Poet *Ovid* calleth an Olympiade *quinquennis Olympias*. Howbeit it

it contained only the ſpace of four years, becauſe the ending year of the proceeding Olympiade was the beginning year of the latter.

The Jubilies of 50. are approven and uſed almoſt by the whole Hebrews and Greeks and by many both moderne Theologues and Chronologues: but the reckoning by them muſt be erroneous, and may be improven by diverſe reaſons.

1. They are no way anſwerable unto the proportion of the ſeptenarie number ſo muchuſed in ſcripture, and upon the which they are grounded. For as the ſingle year is made up of weeks, whereof every one hath ſeven dayes even ſo every hepdomade of yearshath ſeven years, and by conſequent every Jubilie muſt conſiſt of ſeven times ſeven yeares, which are 49. But if one year moe be added, the Jubilie ſhall not end in a ſeventh but in the eight year, and ſo the harmony of the ſeptenary number ſhall be marred.

2. They who reckon by 50. can never be able to make theDeath of ourSaviour to fall out in a Jubilie year, without marring in the particular numbers.

For the juſt number of years from the diviſion

viſion of the land of Canaan, till the Death of CHRIST is, 1421. But if we reckon by the Jubilies of 50. and make 28. as *Hew Bruchton* doth to the death of our Saviour, then there will be twenty eight years wanting, if we make the number 29. Jubilies, which *Iohn Wemes* who reckoneth alſo by 50. then it ſhall exceed by 28. yeares, And if the computation be made by 30. jubilies, as doth *Arr. Montanus*, then the exceſſe ſhall be ſo much the more.

3. The jubilies of 50. doth not mark the moſt notable events of time, as the finiſhing of the building of *Solomons* temple the delivery of the people of Iſrael from the Babyloniſh captivity &c. which is a ſpecial propertie of the jubilies, as *Theobaldus*, *Menſhius* obſerveth Chronol. l. 1. p. 32. and 33.

4. All theſe reckonings are erroneous, in the which the twelfth year of Ezekiah, is not accounted a jubile, and the tenth of *Zedekiah* a ſabbaticall year, but they who reckon by the jubilies of 50. miſſe of both thoſe as ſhall be ſhown in the own place.

The ſecond queſtion is anent the time when

when the jubilies had their beginning, This queſtion hath alſo two branches, the firſt is in what year of the world they began. The ſecond is anent the time and ſeaſon of the year at the which they had their beginning.

I will paſſe by the opinions of ſome who ſtray furtheſt from the truth. One I cannot omit, which approacheth neareſt, but yet miſſeth in a year, the Authors whereof are *Hew Bruchton* in his conſent, *Alſtedius*, and *Henry Ainſworth* writing upon Levit. 25. Thoſe three ſet the beginning of the jubilies at the eight year of *Ioſua*. *Ainſworth* giveth in his reaſon why he beginneth at that time. This law ſaith he took place when they entered in poſſeſſion of the land which was conquered by *Ioſua* in ſeven years, So the eight year after *Moſes* death, was the firſtto be reckoned toward the ſabbath year and year of jubile as appeareth by Joſ. 14. 1,2, 10. &c. For *Caleb* was 40. years old when he was ſent to view the land, in the ſecond year after the comming out of Egypt, Deut. 1. and Num. 13. and they were 38. yeares under *Moſes* in the wilderneſſe, Deut. 2. 14 And when *Caleb* was 15. years old, the land

was

was given them for inheritance, Ioſh. 14. 7. 10. In the eight year of *Joſhua* they began the count. *Henry Ainſworth*, by taking a wrong Periode for his ground, faileth in one year. *Moſes* in the place Deut. 2. reckoneth not preciſely the time of the peoples journeying with him in the wilderneſſe. That Periode beginneth not at the firſt year of the peoples comming out of Egypt, but at the ſecond year: For it was in the ſecond year that they came to Cades, Num. 20. 1. which was their 32 ſtation from whence the ſpyes were ſent. And this Periode of 38. years, which *Ainſworth* hath taken out of Deut. 2. 14. excludeth the laſt year of the peoples being in the wilderneſſe. For the ſpeach of *Moſes* mentioned in that place, was delivered unto the people upon the firſt day of the eleventh moneth of the fourtie year Deut. 1. 4. The which whole year the people were in the wilderneſſe, And in the beginning of the next year after *Moſes* death, they entered into the land of Canaan as may be ſeen, Joſh. 5. 10. 11. where they celebrat the Paſſeover upon the 14. day of the firſt moneth, And ſo in reckoning

ing by *Calebs* age, it will be found that the land was conquered in six years, and consequently that the seventh and not the eight year was the beginning of the sabbaticall years and jubilies, from the which their reckoning must proceed, as *Scaliger* and *Cappellus* rightly proveth by comparing Lev. 25. 3. 4. with Iosh. 14. 1. 2. 10.

Six years shalt thou sow thy seed, v. 3, &c. and to v. 22. but the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, and v. 4. and also thou shalt number unto thee seven sabbaths, even seven times seven years, and the space of the seven sabbaths of years will be unto thee nine and fourty years, And the people were to labour the land six years and to rest the seventh year, But they could not begin to labour till the land was conquered. For in the time of war they lived upon their purchase, taking what they might obtain from the enemie, as the custome is, for their maintainance. Now the conquest of the land was finished when *Caleb* was fourscore and five years of age, that is in the sixt year compleat, after the peoples entry into the same. For *Caleb* was fourty years old when he

he was ſent out with the reſt of the ſpyes to ſpye the land Ioſ. 14. 7. and 10. and that was in the the ſecond year after the peoples comming out of Egypt, Num. 13. after the which time there paſſed 39. years before their entring into the land of Canaan, unto the which if ſix years be added which was the time they ſpent in conquering the land, there ariſeth 85. years, which was *Calebs* juſt age, Ioſh. 14. 10. when after the conqueſt they began to divide the land.

So the ſeventh year from the peoples entry into the land, being the 86. of *Calebs* age, was the year from which the count of ſabbaticall years and jubilies muſt begin,

As for the ſeaſon of the year into the which thoſe ſabbaticall years and jubilies had their beginning: If we conſider the time of the *Jews* firſt ſowing; and the reſtitution of their morgaged lands, and manumiſſion of their ſervants, it was in the moneth Tiſhrie, but if we reſpect the counting of the age of the world by the ſabatical years and jubilies, the beginning muſt be at the moneth Abib, for the ſupervenient of ſolemnities the ſabbaticall years and jubilies altereth

altereth not the former institution set down Exod. 12. 2. *Cappellus* in his treatise of the jubilies toward the end, seemeth to be indifferent at which of them the beginning bee.

3. There is also great question made about the end of the jubilies. Some end them at the time of CHRISTS Baptisme when he began to preach the Gospel, others at his Death, and others at the destruction of Ierusalem.

All those who end Daniels 70. weeks at the death of our Saviour end also the jubilies at the same, And they who end the weeks at the destruction of Ierusalem: make the jubilies also to end therewith, as *Scaliger*, *Polanus* on Daniel 9. *Aistedius* and sundrie others.

It is true indeed that the jubilies were partly accomplished when Christ began to preach the Gospel in the Synagogue of Nazareth, Luk. 4. 18, 19. *&c.* And in other places, as is manifest by that text, and other Scriptures: As also when he sent forth his Apostles through Iudea, Mat. 10. And the 70. Disciples Luk 10. to go before him for

for publiſhing of the Goſpel in the townes and villages where he was to come, which was prefigured by the ſounding of the rams hornes, by the Levites, through all the Synagogues of Iudea, at the day of expiation, in the beginning of the ſolemnitie of the jubile year. But the veritie of the jubilies was not fully and perfectly accompliſhed, till the Death of our Saviour, when by his Blood he made a way patent to Heaven for us, and reſtored us to the right of the heavenly Canaan, which before we had morgadged, and obtained a full remiſſion of our debts unto us, and the jubilies were fully accompliſhed at the Death of Chriſt, as were the reſt of the ceremonies, where alſo Daniels weeks end, as ſhall be ſhown hereafter.

4. Concerning the number of the jubilies it is eaſie to ſet down the ſame, if the years be exactly reckoned from the diviſion of the land, till the Death of our Saviour, which I ſhall prove to be 1421. years, that is neither more nor leſſe then 29. jubilies. Neither is there any great difficulty in ſetting them down rightly in order if the years of

of *Ioshua*, *Iudges*, and *Kings* be rightly numbered, and the four chief Periods mentioned 1 King. 6. 1, Ezech. 4. 5. Ierem. 25. 11, 12. Dan. 9. 24. be taken heed to.

Observe, concerning the sabbaticall years and jubilies, that there is not one of them expresly mentioned in Scripture, but only must be collected by consequent: But there are two sabbaticall years more clearly designed then the rest, to wit, the twelfth of *Ezekias* reigne, which was also a jubilie year, and the tenth of *Zedekiah*. Ier. 34. 8. whereof I am to speak hereafter at the end of the sixth Periode.

Secondly observe a twofold distinction of the jubilies one according to their ranks: and another according to their qualitie of eminence or obscurity.

The first rank or classe beginneth at the division of the land in the seventh year of *Joshuah*, and endeth at the finishing of the building of *Solomons* temple in his eleventh year and containeth 441. years, that is nine jubilies.

The second classe beginneth at the end of the former and endeth at the peoples deli-

very from the Babyloniſh captivitie and it containeth 490. yeares, that is ten jubilies.

The third claſſe beginneth at the peoples delivery, and endeth at the Paſſion of Chriſt containing alſo 490. years, that is other ten jubilies.

Next again they may be diſtinguiſhed after this manner, ſome of them are eminent and illuſtrious, ſerving, not onely for numbering: but alſo for marking of certain memorable and famous accidents, that did come to paſſe at the end of them. There were onely five of the firſt ſort, to wit the ninth, with the which the building of the firſt temple was finiſhed.

The fifteinth in the 12. year of *Ezekiah*, after the which the ſecond year a ſigne was given unto him of delivery from the *Aſſyrians* his enemies. The twentieth with the which the Babyloniſh captivitie endeth: the twentie one at the which the ſecond temple was finiſhed, the twentie ninth and laſt endeth at the death of Chriſt. The other twentie four are all more dark and obſcure, ſerving onely for numbering.

Cappellus hath exactly ſet down the jubilies

bilies of the first classe after this manner.

	1	38	*Othniell.*
	2	47	*Ehud.*
	3	16	*Deborah.*
	4	15	*Gideon.*
Jubile	5 *endeth in the*	8	*of Jair.*
	6	4	*Sampson.*
	7	33	*Eli.*
	8	2	*David.*
	9	11	*Solomon.*

Followeth the fifth PERIODE.

THe fifth PERIODE beginneth at the founding of the temple, and endeth at the destruction thereof, and it containeth 427. years, which are reckoned two manner of wayes, From the fourth year of King *Solomon*, which is the last of the 480. years preceeding till the division of the Kingdom in the first year of *Rehoboam* 36. yeares wherein *Solomon* reigned.

From the division of the Kingdome in the first year of *Rehoboam*, till the ninth year of *Zedekiah*, in the which the city began to

be beſiedged are 390. years, Ezek. 4. 5. 6. every day being put for a year.

For ſo many dayes was Ezekiel commanded typically to bear the iniquitie of the houſe of Iſrael, by Iſrael is meaned both kingdomes reſpective, according to their continuance: For immediatly after the diviſion, the ten tribes fell away to idolatry, and within three years thereafter Juda alſo made defection, 2 Chron. 11. 12. Adde unto thoſe *Zedekias* tenth year, and there ariſeth the juſt number of 437. For his eleventh year was the firſt of the captivitie, So the number of 390. being a round number is put for 391. which is the broken number.

This will be more clear in the particular reckoning. But there the queſtion is alſo, concerning the 40. years mentioned Ezech. 4. 6. ſeverally applyed unto the kingdome of Juda, when they have their beginning and when they end. Thoſe 40. years begin at the 13. year of Joſia as is manifeſt from Jer. 25. And endeth with the tenth year of *Zedekiah*. For *Joſia* in the 12. year of his raigne, began to purge the Temple, and

and to make a reformation, 2 Chron. 34. 34, *&c.* Because of this, the people were fearlesse of any siedge to follow. But their reformation was not sincere, but dissembled and hypocriticall, as the succeeding times did declare. The Lord therefore by his Prophet did threaten the destruction of their city, at the end of those 40. years.

The other way of reckoning this Period is by the years of the other Kings of Juda together with the 36. years of King *Solomons* reign already mentioned.

Rehoboam raigned 17. years, 2 Chron. 12. 13. In the beginning of his raign the kingdome was divided, and ten of the tribes fell to *Jeroboam*, an Ephrathite, Ephraim was mighty among the tribes, and in it stood Samaria their Metrapolis, wherefore under the name of Ephraim every where in the Prophets is meaned the Kingdome of the ten Tribes.

Josia is named more then 300. years before he was born, 1 King. 13. 21.

Unto *Rehoboam* succeeded *Abija* who reigned three years, 2 Chron. 13. 2. There were great warres between him and *Jero-*

boam, & yet he being halfe as many in number to wit 400000. against twice as many, by in-calling upon the Name of the Lord, and putting his truſt in Him, did prevail, and killed of his enemies, 500000. So great a number of ſlain men in one battell are not to be found in any other hiſtory. As *Joſephus* alſo in his antiquities, acknowledgeth and yet he left not the wayes of his father *Rehoboam*.

Aſa raigned 21. years, 2 Chron. 15. 10.
Jehoſophat —— 25 —— 2 Chr. 20. 31
Joram —— 8 —— 2 Chr. 21. 5.
Achazia —— 1 —— 2 Chr. 22. 2.

Alſtedius affirmeth that this year of *Achazia* is to be included partly in the raign of his father *Joram*, and partly in the raign of his mother *Athalia*, which alſo I approve. Such like *Junius* Annot. on 2 King. 8. 26. noteth that this year was imperfect, becauſe *Athalia* his mother began her raigne in it.

Athalia —— 6 —— 2 Chr. 22. 12
Joas —— 40 —— 2 Chr. 24. 2.

of

Of the beginning of the Olympiades, and reckoning bythem.

Cappellus beginneth the Olympiades at the second year of *Joas* in the time of *Lycurgus*, 108. years before *Iphitus* in the year of the world, according to his reckoning, 3116. But *Alstedius* beginneth not the same till the time of *Iphitus* in the year of the world 3174. The distance is 58. yeares. *Bullinger*, *Funckius*, and *Africanus* hold that they began in the second, year of *Jotham*, *Eusebius* beginneth them in the 49. of *Azariah*, *Glarianus* in the 50. *Lucius* in the 46. *Bibliander* in the 13. *Pererius* in the 8. year of *Ahaz*. So there are of distance betwixt the second year of *Joas*, where *Cappellus* beginneth the Olympiades, And the eight of *Achaz*. where *Pererius* beginneth them no lesse then 142 years. So great is the uncertainty, And yet the learnedest men of this time will have them to be a sure rule of reckoning the time of the Persian impire and Daniels 70. weeks, see the vanitie and incertaintie thereof further demonstrate in the Latine edition

edition of *Hew Bruchtons* consent, at the year 3150. in the margin of the book. And howbeit the just time of the beginning of the Olympiades might be found out, yet how shall it be known in what Olympiade, and in what year thereof such and such things did befall, the relations of histories of so ancient time are so doubtful and uncertain among other things in that margin, it is said, that Circe did not so much bewitch Ulisses companions as the Olympiades hath done many learned men.

In the 13. year of *Joas*, they place the building of Carthage.

Amazia raigned — 29 — 2Chr. 25. 1.
Uzzia otherwise *Azaria* — 52 — 2Chr. 26. 1.
Jotham ——— 16 — 2Chr. 27. 2

Cappellus setteth the building of Rome at the fifth year of *Iotham*, in the year of the world 3246. according to his account But *Alstedius* maketh it 49. years earlier, *Scaliger* proveth it altogether uncertain lib. 5. *De emendatione temporum.*

of

Of the Astronomick account called the Æra of Nabonasser.

Cappellus fixeth the Æra of *Nabonasser*, which is the rule of the Astronomicall account, in the 12. year of *Iotham*, in the year of the world 3253. *Alstedius* placeth it at the year of the world 3204. *Bibliander* at the year 3233. Some place this *Nabonazar* in the time of *Ezekia*.

Cappellus and *Alstedius* and some others maketh no small account of this *astronomicall* reckoning, by the Eclipses of the Sun and Moon, for proving of continuance of the *Persian* impire, and the counting of *Daniels* Hepdomades: But he who thinketh that either the one or the other can be found out by the terrestriall Olympiades of the Greeks, or the Celestiall Eclipses of the Chaldeans seemeth to me to be greatly Ecclipsed in the light of his understanding. I must therefore stay a litle upon the declaring of the unsufficiency of the latter.

They are so uncertain and doubtfull in describing of this *Nabonassar*, that they know

not well what to make of him: *Melanchton* taketh him to be the ſame with *Salmanaſſar*. *Scaliger* thinketh him to be no other nor *Balladan* mentioned Iſai. 39. 1. *Cappellus* eſteemeth *Balladan* to have been the ſon of *Nabonaſſar*, and father to him whom *Ptolmeus* calleth *Mardokempad*, and grand-father to *Merodah Balladan*: But *Alſtedius* taketh thoſe laſt two to be both one. The firſt who maketh any mention of this *Nabonaſſar* is *Claudius Ptolemeus*, who lived in the time of the Emperour *Antoninus pius* 220. years after CHRIST. The ſpace betwixt the dayes of *Hezekiah* and *Antoninus-pius* is at leaſt 900 years. All this time their is no mention in any Greek or Roman hiſtorie of *Nabonoſſar*, all are ſilent of him. But as Tages was digged up out of the earth at a ſudden, even ſo he ariſeth unexpected.

Ptolomeus in his fourth book c. 6. ſetteth the firſt of the three moſt ancient Eccliplſes obſerved by the Babylonians in the firſt year of *Mardokempad*: the ſecond, in his ſecond year. The third in that ſame year. The firſt of thoſe Eccliplſes, *Cappellus* ſeteth

eth in the year of the world. 3279. But *Alstedius* in the. 3180. The second Eclipse *Cappellus* placeth in the year 3280. But *Alstedius* in the 3230.

So well do they agree in setting of the Eclipses, which most be a sure ground of reckoning unto us. Ane other horrible Eclipse *Alstedius* bringeth out of *Dionysius Hallicarnasseus*. 2. book which he seteth in the year of the world. 3235. And in the 38 year from the building of Rome *Dionysius Hallicarnasseus* had little skill of the age of the world: For he was a heathen not acquainted with Scripture, whereby only we have sure knowledge of the beginning thereof. But because he setteth the former Eclipse in the 38 year of the citie of Rome, Therefore *Alstedius* guesseth it to have been in 3235. year of the world And how small certaintie there is for the time of the building of Rome may be seen in *Scaligers* fifth book of emendation of times, cited a little before.

But if ye will have further assurance of the time of this Eclipse, *Alstedius* telleth us that it was immediatly before *Sennacherib*, lossed 185000. souldiers at Jerusalem

that ſame year, Iſa. 37. And this was in the 14. year of *Hezekiah*, Iſa. 36. 1. But what if this Eccliſe was not in that year but in the year thereafter? What if there was no Eccliſe at all, but the Sun went back ten degrees in the Dyall of *Achaz*, for a ſign to *Hezekiah* of his Health?

The Ambaſſadours of *Merodah Baladan* King of Babylon, who were ſent to inquire anent the Miracle, might well make report at their return to their own country, as if it had been an Eccliſe, or the Chaldean Aſtrologians being miſtaken, might have reckoned it for an Eccliſe, as *Ixion* being deceived, took the Cloud for Juno. But let it be ſo, that there was an Eccliſe of the Sun that ſame year which *Alſtedius* mentioneth, why have the Chaldean Aſtrologians ſo punctually obſerved that, and in the mean time have forgotten to Regiſter the Miraculous going baek of the Sun the next year, far more remarkable then any ordinar Eccliſe, eſpecially ſince they could not at all be ignorant thereof, their King ſending his Ambaſſadours of ſet purpoſe to *Hezekiah* to enquire thereanent?

Ptolomeus

Ptolomeus l. 4. c. 9. telleth us of an Eclipse of the Moon 245. years, and 327. dayes after *Nabonassar*, the 20. year of *Darius Histaspis* the third King of Persia, and l. 4. c. 9. he telleth us of an other Eclipse of the Moon in the 31. year of *Dar. Histaspis*. But what shall be thought of those Eclipses, if *Dar. Histaspis* did not at all raigne 20. years?

Tertulian giveth unto him but 19. *Eusebius* following *Aben Ezra* but 12. For *Hew Bruchtoun* in his *Prolegomena* before his Commentare upon *Daniel* declareth out of *Clesias* the Greek Historian, that he lived not above 43 yeares, And even in *Cyrus* time whose Armour bearer he was, as *Ælianus* reporteth in his 12. book of *Varius* historie. c. 43. he had attained to the age of a man. And betwixt him and *Cyrus* did interveen the reigne of *Cambyses* and *Smerdes Magus*: So that by all appearance he did not raign the third of 31. years. Last I desire to understand how it cometh to passe that those so diligent observers of the Ecclipses, have omited that most Admirable and extraordinary Eclipse

clipse of the Sun which was at the death of our Saviour. Luk. 23. 44. 45.

This much I have thought good to set down, as most pertinent to this place concerning the insufficience of the Ecliptick Chronologie borrowed from Heathens, for counting of *Daniels* weeks, that my labour may be spared hereafter, when I shall intreat of that Periode.

Cyrus is named 180. before his birth, Isa. 44. 28.

Achaz raigned — 16 years 2 Chr. 28. 1
Hezekiah — 29 — 2 Chr. 29. 1.
Mannasses — 55 — 2 Chr. 33. 1.
Ammon — 2 — 2 Chr. 33. 21
Josia — 31 — 2 Chr. 34. 1.
Jechoahaz — 3 *moneths* — 2 Chr. 36 2.
Jehoiakim — 11 — 2 Chr. 36. 5.

Jechoahaz his three moneths must be reckoned in with *Jechoiakims* eleven years.

Jechonias otherwayes called *Jechoiachin* ruled 3. moneths, 2 King. 24. 8. Those three moneths must be contained under the raigne of the next King.

Mattanias otherwayes called *Zedekias* raigned 11. years, 2 King. 24. 18.

Here

Here endeth the fifth Periode, containing 427. years at the tenth of *Zedekia*.

But before I proceed any further, I must set down the Chronologie of the Kings of Israel.

Jeroboam raigned 22 years, 1 Kin. 14. 20
Nadab —— 2 —— 1 King. 15. 25.
Baasa —— 24 — 1 King. 15. 33.
Ela his son whom *Zimri* killed 2 — 1 Kin. 16. 8.
Zimri 7. dayes —— 1 King. 16. 15
Omri —— 12 years, — 1 Kings 16. 23.

He builded Samaria, which was the Metropolis of the ten Tribes, after that *Zimri* had burnt himself in Tirza.

Achab his son raigned 22 years 1 Kin. 16. 29
Achazias —— 2 —— 1. 22. 51.
Joram his brother —— 12 — 2. 8. 5.
Jehu —— 28 —— 2. 10. 36.
Joahaz —— 17 —— 2. 13. 1.
Joash —— 16 —— 2. 13. 10.
Jeroboam —— 41 —— 2. 14. 23.

Followed an interreign for the space of 23 years betwixt the last year of *Jeroboam* King of Israel which was the fifteenth of *Azariah* King of Juda. And the 38. of *Azaria* in the

the which *Zecharia* the ſon of *Ieroboam* began to raign over Iſrael, which is collected by comparing, 2 King. 15. 1. with the eight verſe of the ſame chapter.

Zecharia raigned — 6 moneths 2 Kin. 15.8
Sallum ——— 1 moneth — 2. 15.13
Menahen 10 compare c. 15. v. 17. with v. 23
Pekaia —— 2 —— chap. 15. 23
Peka —— 20 ——— v. 27
Hoſea ——— 9 —— c. 17. v. 1.

In the ninth year of *Hoſea*, *Salmanaſſer* King of *Aſſur* took Samaria, and carried Iſrael unto Aſſur in the ſixt year of *Hezekiah* King of Judah, 2 King. 18. 10. So that Kingdome continued about 306. years or thereby after the diviſion: But in comparing the time of the Kings of Iſrael and foreſaid interreigne, with the years of the Kings of Juda, till the 6. of *Hezekiah* it will be found that the time of the Kings of Iſrael, exceedeth the other by the ſpace of four years, whereof I am to ſpeak in the 11. Queſtion following.

QUESTION FIRST.

IT is ſaid 1 King. 15. 33. that in the third year of *Aſa* King of Juda, began *Baaſa* the ſon

the son of *Ahija* to raigne. But how could this be, since, before him, *Ieroboam* raigned 22. yeares, and *Nadab* 2. years, and *Rechoboam* King of Juda raigned only 17. years, and *Abiam* his son the father of *Asa* 3. years and c. 15. 9. it is said that in the 20. year of *Ieroboam* King of Israel, began *Asa* to raign. There are here 2. years of distance.

Answer. Nadabs 2. years must be counted as broken and incompleet, whereof the first was coincident with the last of his father *Ieroboam*, and the last with the first of *Baasa* his successor. This reckoning must of necessitie hold: Otherwise, how can it be said that *Baasa* began to raigne in the third year of *Asa* King of Juda.

QUESTION second.

IT is said again 1. Kings 15. 33. That in the third year of *Asa* King of Juda, began *Baasa* to reigne over Israel in Tirza 24. years, And 2. Chron. 15. 19. it is said, That there was no more warre untill the 35. year of *Asa*, and c. 16. 1. In the 36. year of *Asa*, came *Baasa* King of Israel against Juda. &c. There are eleven

yeares of diſtance. If *Baaſa* (beginning at the third year of *Aſa* reigned only 24. years) how could he come againſt Judah in the 36. year of *Aſa*?

Beroaldus Junius, and *Cappellus* anſwere that the 35. yeares are not to be reckoned from the third year of *Aſa*, when *Baaſa* began to reigne, but from the firſt year of the ſchiſme and diviſion of the two Kingdomes of Judah and Iſrael. for *Jeroboam* reigned 22. years. *Nadab.* 2. before *Baaſa*. So the 35. years end in the 15. of *Aſa* and the 15. of *Aſa* was the 35. year after the ſchiſme. Therefore when it is ſaid, that there was no more warre untill the 35. year of *Aſa*, this muſt not be ſimpleley underſtood of the 35. year of his reign: but of his 35. year after the ſchiſme, which was only the 12. year of *Baaſa*.

Queſtion third.

IN the firſt Book of Kings 22. 42. It is ſaid that *Joſaphat* raigned 25. years. Now in the 18. year of *Joſaphat* began *Jehoram* King of Iſrael to raign 12. years, 2 King. 3. 1. And in the fifth year of this

Ioram

Ioram, which was the 22. year of *Iosaphat* began *Iehoram* of Judah to reign. 8. years 2 King. 8. 16. 17. whereas there remained yet four years of his Fathers reign.

Answer. It appeareth that he reigned those 4. years conjunct with his Father, and 8. alone thereafter, compare 2 King. 3. 1. with c. 8. 25. and 26. following.

Question fourth.

2. KIngs 8. 25. It is said, that in the 12. year of *Ioram* the son of *Ahab* King of Israel, did *Achazia* the son of *Iehoram* King of Judah begin to reign, and again c. 9. 29. It is said, that in the eleventh year of *Ioram* the son of *Ahab* began *Achazia* to reign.

The Answer is that he began to raign in the eleventh year of *Ioram* compleet, and the twelth beginning.

Question fisth.

BUt the greatest difficultie remaineth, whereby the Wits of diverse Learned Men have been greatly puzled. It is said, 2 King. 8. 26. That *Achazia* was 22. years

old, when he began to raign, 2 Chron. 22 2. It is said that he was 42. years old, when he began to reign, and before 2 Chron. 21. 20. It is said that *Iehoram* his father was 32. yeares old, when he began to reign, and raigned 8. years in Jerusalem, whereby it would appear that he was two years elder then his father.

Some professe that they could finde no sufficient answer for this doubt. *Cardinall Cajetan*, and *Scaliger* affirme that 2 Chro. 22 for 42. is to be red 22. But this Answer is dangerous, and importeth a corruption in the Originall, which must not be admitted. *Hew Bruchton*, and *Cappellus* Answereth that the fourty two years are not to be numbered as the full age of *Achazia*, when he began to reign, but that the reckoning must bee made from the time, that *Omri* his grandfather (by his mother) began fully to reign in Samaria, after the death of Tibni, which was in the 31. year of *Asa* compleet 1 King. 16. 23. and are to be numbered in this manner. From *Asais* 31. year, there remained 10. years of his reign, *Iosaphat* reigned 25. in the which four years are comprehended

prehended, wherein *Ioram* his son as Viceroy reigned with him, and then *Ioram* reigned 8. years by himself, Summa 42. for *Iorams* last year and *Achazias* first were coincident, which is a thing very frequent in the time of the raign of Kings. Or if ye will number by the Kings of Israel, the count may be after this way. *Omri* 6. *Achab* 22. *Achazia* 2. *Ioram* 12. So reckoning his own age, he was 22. years, but reckoning his descent from *Omri* 42. To this account agreeth the Learnedst of the Hebrews. *Iunius* in his Translation, 2 Chron. 22. 2. differeth in the exposition of the place, and alledgeth that there is a transposition in the words, yet he deduceth the 42. years from the same root. This forme of reckoning seemeth to be used, in remembrance of the fearful judgement of God upon the posteritie of *Omri* in both kingdomes, for their wickednes and idolatry.

Question sixth.

IT is recorded 2 King. 14. 2. that *Amazia* reigned 29. years, and v. 23. That from the 15. of *Amazia Ieroboam* King of Israel

began to raign, and c. 15. 1. That in the 27. year of *Ieroboam* King of Iſrael began *Azaria* the ſon of *Amazia* King of Juda to reign. There are here 12. years in diſtance betwixt the laſt year of the reign of *Amazia*, and the firſt year of his ſon *Uzia* or *Azaria*.

Lavater, *Hew Bruchton*, and *Cappellus* Anſwer, that in this time there was an interreign in the Kingdome of Juda, which is the Truth, but thoſe 12. years muſt not be reckoned within the compaſſe of *Amazias* reign, but within the reign of his ſon *Uzia* in the time of his minoritie, as a part of his 42. years beginning from his fathers death, 2 King. 15. For if *Amazia* was killed in the 15. year of *Ieroboam*, and *Azariah* entered his reign in the 27. of *Ieroboam* being then 16. years of age, 2 King. 15. 2. and 2 Chron. 26. 3. then he was onely 4. years old at the death of his father, unfit for managing the affairs of a Kingdome, ſo that all the ſpace of thoſe twelve years of his minoritie the Kingdom behoved to be governed by others.

Queſtion

Question seven, eight, nine, ten.

WEE Read, 2 King. 18. 1. that *Hezekiah* began to raign in the third of *Hosea* King of Israel, but in the 2 King. 15. 30 the same *Hosea* is said to have reigned in the 20. of *Iotham*, which year was coincident with the fourth of *Achaz Hezekiahs* father, as may be collected by the numbering, and comparing of their yeares, from whence ariseth diverse doubts.

1. There is great appearance of contradictions betwixt the former places. 2. There is great appearance of contradiction also betwixt v. 30. and 33. of 2 King. 15. For in the 30. verse, *Iotham* is said to have reigned 20. years, but v. 33. only 16.

3. It seemeth altogether to be overturned which before was brought from 2 King. 18. 1. to wit, that *Hezekiah* began to reign in the third year of *Hosea*, for since the beginning of the reign of *Hosea* did fall in the 20. of *Iotham* 2 King. 15. 30. and the 20. of *Iotham* was the fourth of *Achaz*, and the third year of *Hosea* shall be the seventh of *Achaz*. But how could either *Achaz* reign

16.

16. years, whileas *Hezekiah* did reign in his seventh year? or how could *Hezekiah* be 25. years of age when he began to reign, as is written, 2 King. 18. 2. for so the solution given by some falleth, who think that *Hezekiah* did reign certain years conjunct with his father *Achaz*: By reason that this difficultie still remaineth. If *Hezekias* when he began to raign was 25. years old, as is said, 2 King. 18. 2. It will thence follow, that *Hezekias* was begotten by *Achaz* in the second year of his age, and that in the same year being in the credle, he raigned with his father.

4. So *Hoseas* is said at least to have reigned 9. years 2. Kings 17. 1. but if he began his reign in the fourth year of *Achaz*, which is coincident with the 20. of *Iotham* and *Achaz* reigned 16. yeares how can either the first year of *Hezekias* reigne be the third of *Hosea* as is mentioned 2. Kings 18. 1. or the fourth year of *Hezekia* be the seventh of *Hosea* as is said 2. Kings. 18. 9. For so *Hoseas* must have reigned many moe years then nine. Here are a number of very great doubtes and almost inextricable

inextricable. They are indeed hard to resolve but not impossible, they are apparently, but not really and in effect contradictorious.

For resolving of the former doubtes two distinctions must be taken hold of. 1. we may observe in the Scripture a two-fold reigne of Kings and among the rest in particular of *Hosea*: the one is free, the other tributary: for the which cause, without contradiction one may be said in diverse respects to have reigned moe or fewer years. 2. the reigne of a King may be esteemed lawfully possessed, or then tyranically usurped: righteously obtained by lawfull election, and confirmation, or unjustly conquered. by explication and application of those distinctions the answer unto the former doubts will be more manifest.

To the first question, it is to be said that *Hoseas* without contradiction reigned both in the fourth and twelfth year of *Achaz*, in the fourth as a free King, in the twelfth as tributary and vassall to the Assyrians after that he had been subdued by *Salmannassar*. 2. Kings 18. 3. It may be also said according

cording to the next distinction, that *Hosea* by tyranny invaded the kingdome when conspiring against *Pekah* (the lawfull King) he had killed him in the 20. year of *Iotham*, that is in the fourth of *Achaz*. 2. Kings 15. 30. and again, that the same (in the 12 year of *Achaz*, that is eight years after) was confirmed to him either by the peoples or the King of Asyrians consent.

Unto the second question, I answer according to *Spanhemius* in his first part of Evangelick doubtes, from whom I have borrowed those former four questiones with the answers, that *Iothams* 20. years are so called originally not terminatively, as he saith, not that precisely he raigned 20. years: but that the computation of those years is derived from the beginning of *Iothams* raigne. Therefore when in the thirtie verse *Hoseas* is said to have raigned in the 20. year of *Iotham*, it is to be understood that he reigned in the 20. year from the beginning of *Iothams* raigne, which no ways hindereth that *Iotham* should have raigned 16 years only, as is set down v. 33. For that came to passe 4. yeares after the death of

of *Iotham*; wherefore it is ſaid to have befallen, not in the 20. year of the raigne of *Iotham*, but only in the 20. year of *Iotham*, howbeit thoſe ſpeaches be ſometimes taken otherwiſe. This former diſtinction may be applyed unto the ſecond and fifth queſtiones.

Unto the third, I anſwer from the things that were ſet down before, to wit that *Hezekias* began to raigne in the third year of *Hoſeas* raign, not free, but being uſurped: or then made tributary and then confirmed. So howbeit the beginning of *Iothames* raigne did befall in the fourth of *Achaz*, yet *Hezekia* began to raigne in the 12. of *Achaz*. So the third year of *Hoſea* is the ſeventh of *Achaz*, to wit his third year being free and not tributary, but *Hezekias* began to raigne in the third year of *Hoſea*, not free, but tributary. wherefore neither is it denyed that *Achaz* raigned 16. years nor is it eſtabliſhed that *Hezekias* raigned in the ſeventh of *Achaz*, neither is it infringed that *Hezekias* was 25. years old when he began to raigne, neither doth it follow that *Hezekias* was begotten in the ſecond year

year of *Achaz*, or that he began to raigne with him in his craddle, which is moſt cleare by the application of the former diſtinction.

Unto the fourth queſtion, In like manner it is anſwered from the premiſſes, that *Hoſeas* in whole reigned 18. years, nine years as a free King, and other nine tributary. And therefore without any abſurditie (thoſe years being conjunctlie taken) he began either to raigne or uſurpe the kingdom in the fourth year of *Achaz*, and nevertheleſſe the third year of his raign (not free but tributary) fell in the firſt year of *Hezekias*, and the fourth of *Hezekias* was extended unto the beginning of the ſeventh year of *Hoſea*.

Queſtion eleventh.

IN comparing the continuance of the two kingdomes of Juda and Iſrael from the ſchiſm and diviſion to the ſixth year of *Hezekia* in the which the kingdome of Iſrael ended, as hath been ſhown a little before, it will be found by numbering of the years of both Kingdomes, that the time of the Kingdom of Iſrael doth exceed the other by

by four years. What then is to be said to this?

Answer. The difference is to be reconciled this way, *Nadab* the son of *Jeroboames* two years were imperfect, the first whereof was coincident with *Ieroboams* last year, and the latter with *Baasa* his successors first, as is mentioned in the first Question.

In like manner *Achazia's* two years were imperfect, the first whereof was coincident with *Achabs* last year, and the latter with *Iehorames* first year. See *Iun.* Annot. on 1 King. 22. 51.

Question twelfth.

WEE read in the 2 King. 24. 8. that *Iehoiachin* was eighteen years old when he began to reign, and 2 Chron. 36. 9. It is said that he was eight years old when he began to reign. *Iunius* upon the place answereth, that the Pronown hee is to be referred not to *Iehoiachin*, but to *Iehoiakim* his father, mentioned in the preceeding verse.

Question

Queſtion thirteen.

THe laſt queſtion is anent the year in the which *Ezechiel* began to Propheſie, which c. 1. v. 1. he calleth the thirtie year and v. 2. the fifth year *Iehoiachins* captivity, anent the which there are diverſe opinions: Some think this to have been the 30 year of the 17 Moſaicall Jubilie, But herein they ſtray exceeding farre: For the fifth year of *Iechonias* captivity did not befall in the 17 Jubilie, which ended in the 24. year of the reign of *Ioſia*, but in the fifth year of *Zedekias* reign, which was the thirteen of *Nebuchadnezar*, and the 31 of the 18 Jubilie, as may eaſily be gathered by juſt numbering of the years.

An other opinion is ſet down by *Scaliger*, and *Cappellus*, who affirm that this was the 30 year of *Nabopolaſſar* King of Babels reign, otherwiſe called *Nebuchadnezar* the elder, with whom his ſon *Nebuchadnezar* the Great (for certain years) was conjunct in the government.

Againſt this, it is replyed by *Tormellus* (as *Cappellus* himſelf relateththe) at *Nabopolaſſar*

laſſar lived onely 21. years. *Cappellus* anſwereth that there is a lapſe in the writing, and that εἴκοσι ἓν is put for εἴκοσι ἔννεα, that is, 21. for 29. But *Cappellus* underſtood ſufficiently, that there is the difference of a year between 29. and 30. And if *Nabopalaſſar* lived only 29. years, *Ezechiel* could not prophecy in the 30. year of his reigne. Moreover, *Nabopalaſſar* is not once named in Scripture, neither is there any thing ſtoried of him in the ſame. And it is moſt like, that if *Ezechiel* was to deſigne the time of his prophecy by the reigne of any of the Kings of *Babel*, he would have marked the ſame by the years of his ſon *Nebuchadnezar* the great, who is both mentioned in Scripture, and much therein recorded of him. Beſide this, the reaſon that they bring for their aſſertion doth not alwayes hold, to wit, that the captives, or vanquiſhed party, muſt alwayes follow the notation of time uſed by the victors: and that in Chaldea the 30. year muſt (of neceſſity) be meaned of a Chaldean King; for *Ezechiel* (notwithſtanding at this time he was a captive in Chaldea) never noteth the years by the reigne of the Chaldean

Chaldean Kings, but ever by *Iechonias* captivity, and that throughout all his Prophecie, which was onely for the space of 25. years from his first vision c. 1. till his last. c 40. To this effect, See c. 8. v. 1. c. 20. 1. c. 24. 1. c. 26. 1. c. 29. 1. c. 31. 1. and 32. 1.

The third opinion is of those who think that this was the 30. year of *Ezeckiels* age, by the which he being a Preist (as is said v. 3.) would demonstrate the lawfull time of his entry to the Ministry according as is statute concerning the Priests Num. 4. 3. Which is the opinion of *Gregor. Magnus* writing upon the place, and is approven by *Polanus*, wherein also he saith that he was the type of CHRIST, who at that same time entered his Ministrie: And *Ierome* upon the place, affirmeth that this was not only the age of *Ioseph*, when he was promoted by *Pharaoh* and furnished victuall to the Egyptians Gen. 41. But also of *Iohn Baptist*, when he began to preach and baptize, both of them (in this) resembling CHRIST. But this oppinion is rejected by *Cappellus*: his reason is, because not any one of the other

Prophets

Prophets any where counteth by the years of his own age. This is a very ſlender objection. For their are many things found in diverſe of the Prophets, the like whereof is not alwayes to be found in any of the reſt, as might be inſtanced in diverſe particulars which are needleſſe heere to be rehearſed: I ſee no ſufficient reaſon therefore of rejecting this aſſertion.

The laſt opinion is of ſome of the Hebrews whom *Tremell* and *Iunius* followeth and is alſo approven by *Polanus*, which is, that this 30. is to be reckoned from the 18. year of *Ioſias*, in the which the book of the Law was found, 2 King. 22. And this I hold to be with good warrant affirmed. For if we reckon *incluſivè* from the 18. year of *Foſias* who reigned 31. years, there will be 14. years. Unto thoſe adde firſt eleven years of the reigne of *Jehoiakim*, and then five years after the captivity of *Jechonias*: there ariſeth the juſt number of 30. yeares. I do think therefore that this opinion is without any good reaſon rejected by *Scaliger*, and diſanulled by *Cappellus*. In like manner *Jeremiah* deduceth the beginning of his Pro-

phecy, from the 13. year of *Josias*, Jerem. 25. 3. which was the year immediatly following the beginning of *Iosia's* famous Reformation.

THE SIXTH PERIODE.

THe sixth Periode containeth the 70. years of the Jewish captivity foretold by *Jeremiah.* only c. 25. 11. 12. c. 27. 5 6, 7. c. 29. 10. &c. and by no other of the Prophets.

There preceeded a twofold captivitie of the ten Tribes, of the whith I have spoken already: Neither will I speak of the captivity of *Mannasse* King of Juda, but of the other four captivities that followed: the first of *Jehoiakim* in the seventh year of *Nebuchadnezar*; The second of *Jehoiachin* his son, in the eight year of *Nebuchadnezar*: The third in the 11. of *Zedekiah*, and 18. and 19. of *Nebuchadnezar*; The fourth in the 23. of his reign.

The question is, at which of all these four the 70. years take their beginning? Concerning the last, there needeth not to be much spoken: For I finde none setting the beginning

beginning thereof at the 23. of *Nebuchadnezar*, except one in a manuscript: his reason is, because there was no finall desolation of the Land till then.

But the captives who were then taken away were but some poor people of the Land, whom *Nebuzaradan* the captaine of the Guarde had left for dressing the vines, and tilling the land. Jer. 52. 16. The number was but 745. Persons. Now to say that the Land was not desolate till then, is as if we should deny that the sheaves were taken away out of the field, or that any reaping were in the time of harvest, because that there are some few gleannings left in the furrows untaken away with the rest.

All the Question then will be anent the three former captivities, the first whereof was in *Jehoiakims* time anent the which two things are needfull to be cleared. 1. In what year of *Jehoiakim* it befell. 2. Whether or not the 70. years take their beginning thereat.

Vatablus, *Junius* on Dan. 1. 1. *Cappellus* in his twofold historie and *Andro Willet* in his Hexapla on Dan. 1. 1. quest. 1. and 2.

think that this captivitie befell in *Jehoiakims* third year, at the end thereof, and the beginning of his fourth year, which they collect from Dan. 1. 1. and Jer. 25. 1. and they affirme *Nebuchadnezars* first year to have befallen partly in the one, and partly in the other.

But *Polanus* writing on Dan. 1. 1. rightly Distinguisheth the times, which are confounded by them. He sheweth that Jer. 25 1. there is onely set down a Prophecie of that which was to be accomplished thereafter, which Prophecie *Jeremia* delivered in the fourth year of *Jehoiakims* reign, in the first of *Nebuchanezar*, and in the 23. year from the 13. of *Josia*, in the which he began his Reformation. It is not said there that either *Jehoiakim*, or any of his people were taken Captives at that time by *Nebuchadnezar*. There is no such thing in the Text: But the Prophet speaketh only of a Captivitie, which was to follow thereafter, and to be accomplished not onely upon the Kingdom of Juda, but also upon many other adjacent nations, as is collected from v. 9. v. 11. and vers. 19, 20. &c. of that same Chapter,

chapter, and followed at *Zedekias* Captivity.

And as for *Jehoiakims* third year mentioned, Dan. 1. 1. *Polanus* proveth it not absolutely to be the third year of his reign, but the third year of his reign, after that he became tributary to *Nebuchadnezar*, which was the eleventh year after the Kingdome was taken from his brother *Iehoahaz* by *Pharaoh Necho*, and given to him in the seventh year of *Nebuchadnezar*. This he proveth by 2 Kin. 24. 1. where it is said, that in *Iehoiakims* dayes came *Nebuchadnezar* King of Babel up, and *Iehoiakim* became his servant three years, and afterward hee turned and rebelled against him, and the Lord sent against him Bands of the Chaldeans, &c. Agreeable to this is that which is spoken Dan. 1. 1, 2.

But nowayes that which is said, Jer. 25. 1, 2, 3. For there nothing is spoken of the third, but of the fourth year of *Iehoiakim*, and nothing Dan. 1. 1. is said of any year of *Nebuchadnezars* reign, as the first thereof is mentioned Jer. 25. neither is there a word in that Chapter of any present Captivitie. as there is Dan. 1. 1.

Andro Willet alleadgeth that *Polanus* is deceived in affirming that the Captivity ſpoken of Jer. 52. 28. in the ſeventh year of *Nebuchadnezzar*, was the firſt Captivitie when *Daniel* was carried away; For (ſaith he) there was two aſſaults and invaſions of the Land in the reign of *Jehoiakim*, one in the third and fourth year of his reign, and the firſt of *Nebuchadnezzar*, another in the eleventh, which was the ſeventh of *Nebuchadnezzar*, whereof *Ieremiah* ſpeaketh.

Aſſuredly *Polanus* is not deceived, but *A. W.* in cenſuring of *Polanus* is deceived, and draweth himſelf under juſt cenſure. He alleadgeth that there were two aſſaults of the Land of Juda in the reign of *Iehoiakim*: true indeed, but there were not two Captivities; For at the firſt aſſault *Jehoiakim* yeelded and became tributary, as is manifeſt by the place cited, 2 King. 24. 1. &c. Neither was there any Captivity till the third year of his ſubjection to *Nebuchadnezzar*, which was the eleventh year of his reign, and the ſeventh of *Nebuchadnezzar*, in the which both *Daniel* with ſundry others, and *Jehoiakim* himſelf fell into the hands of the Chaldeans, Dan.

1. 1,

1. 1, 2. 2 King. 24. 1. *Willet* subjoineth that the first of those was in the third and fourth year of *Jehoiakim*, and first of *Nebuchadnezar*.

I have declared already that those words (the third year of *Jehoiakim*) are ambiguous. There is no Scripture which can prove absolutely the first assault to have been in the third year of *Jehoiakims* reigne, but in his eight year, that is three years before he rebelled against *Nebuchadnezar*, and fell into the hands of the Chaldeans: At the which third year was *Jehoiakims* Captivity, as hath been proven out of 2 Kings 2. 24. To this agreeth *Gualter* in his Chronologie, and *Theodorus Bibliander* in his sixth Table. And yet *Jehoiakim* himself came never unto Babell, but died in the journey, as appeareth by Jer. 22. 18, 19.

This I adde further against *Willets* censure of *Polanus*, that if *Jehoiakim* was subdued to *Nebuchadnezar* in the third or fourth year of his reign, at the which time it is alleadged that the first assault was made upon him then he was subject and tributary, not three, but seven years, or eight, which directly crosseth

croſſeth the Text, 2 Kings 24. for ſo long time muſt paſſe betwixt his third or fourth year, till the eleventh, which was the laſt year of his reign.

The Queſtion yet remaineth, whether or not the Periode of 70. years beginneth at *Iehoiakims* Captivity.

Lyranus in his Commentary. *H. Bruchton* in his conſent, and *Cappellus* his twofold Hiſtory, ſetteth the beginning of the 70. years thereat.

But they are alwayes in an error, imagining that there was a Captivity in the fourth year of *Iehoiakim*, and firſt of *Nebuchadnezzar*, which without ſufficient ground they would gather from Jerem. 25. 1, 2, 3, *&c.* compared with the 9. and 12. verſes following, as already hath been ſhown. The continuation and courſe (ſaith *Cappellus*) doth ſufficiently declare that from the fourth of *Iehoiakim*, and firſt of *Nebuchadnezzar* both the Babyloniſh empire taketh the beginning, and the ſervitude of the Jews and deſolation of Judea: and that all thoſe together continued 70. years. To the ſame purpoſe ſaith *H. Brughton* that *Ieremiah* in the firſt year of *Nebuchadnezzar*

Nebuchadnezar did foretell that the Jews and other nations ſhould ſerve the King of Babylon 70. years: therefore thoſe years are to be counted from thence.

For anſwer, We muſt diſtinguiſh betwixt the foretelling of a thing by Prophecy, and the fulfilling thereof: diverſe things are not immediatly accompliſhed after they are foretold.

Firſt then let *Polanus* his anſwer meet *Hugh Brughton.* In the 25. of *Ieremiah* (ſaith he) the time of *Iehoiakims* captivity is not noted, but only the time of the Oracle of the future deſolation and captivity of the kingdome and people of the Jews: So *Polanus* on Dan. 1.

Again, that which *Cappellus* affirmeth, can no wayes be collected from Jerem. 25. For the courſe of the ſpeach in that Chap. doth not at all declare thoſe things which he alledgeth: not the captivity of *Iehoiakim* in his fourth year, nor the ſervitude and deſolation of the Jews at that time, but only that the ſame was to follow thereafter; Neither yet *Nebuchadnezars* preſent ſubduing of the Jewiſh nation, which was not till three years before *Jechoiakims* captivity.

In

In a word, whatsoever is uttered, Jer. 25. is spoken indefinitely, and is not directly applyed to any other particular captivity, but unto that, whereby a finall overthrow was brought upon the nation. As for that which was in *Jechoiakims* time, it was not of such moment, as the other two that successively followed; for it being in the seventh year of *Nebuchadnezar*, there were only 3023. Jews carried away at that time, Jer. 52. 28. which was but a small number in regard of that nation, which was so populous, that in *Davids* time, Juda only did afford 500000. men fit for war, 2 Sam. 24. 9. In the dayes of *Abiam*, 400000., 2 Chron. 13. 2. In *Josaphats* time, 1200000. 2 Ch. 17. 14, *&c.*

In the mean time I desire this to be observed, that of the four captivities before mentioned, some were earlier, and some later. Now we may not imagine that all those people who were taken away in those captivities did stay precisely 70. years, at Babylon. For then it should follow, that as there were four diverse Captivities, the first whereof was in distance from the last

16.

16. years, even so there should also be four deliveries correspondent unto those, all of them differing from other, which would not make 70. years as the Scripture doth, but four diverse septuagints of years. It is certain then, that some of those captives stayed in Babylon longer then 70. years, and some others a shorter time. The beginning therefore of those 70. years must bee fixed at the most eminent and famous Captivity, which was neither the first nor the second.

Theodorus Bibliander in his sixth Table, *Joseph Scaliger* in his sixth Book of Emendation of Times, *Junius* in his Annot. on 2 Chron. 36. 20. *Alsted.* Fundament. Chronol. 20. *A. Willet* in his sixfold Commentare on Dan. c. 9. Quest. 15. setteth the beginning of those 70. years at *Jechonias* Captivity, in the eight year of *Nebuchadnezar.* *Andro Willet* bringeth five Reasons to prove the same. The first hee taketh out of Jer. 29. 10. where the Prophet writeth unto those who were into Captivitie with *Jechonia*; that after 70. years the Lord would visite them.

That

That letter was written after *Jechonias* Captivitie, and was ſent unto all thoſe who were Captives with him v. 4. and not onely unto thoſe, but alſo unto them who went away in *Jehoiakims* Captivitie. The Reaſon therefore will ſerve no leſſe to prove the beginning of the 70. years to have been at *Jehoiakims* Captivitie. Yea, there is nothing ſpoken Ier. 29. which was not generally ſpoken to all the Iewes before there was any Captivity either of *Jehoiakim*, *Jechonias* or *Zedekias*, c. 25. *Jeremiah* c. 29. declareth that at the end of 70. years they ſhould return: but neither the beginning of thoſe 70. years, nor the end thereof is expreſly determined. Thoſe years therefore muſt take their beginning from the moſt remarkable root of time amongſt all the captivities, which was not *Jechonia's* captivity.

His ſecond reaſon is, becauſe Eſt. 2. 6. direct mention is made of the captivity of *Jechoniah*, when *Mordecai* went away with him. This reaſon is ſuch a one as no wayes agreeth with Doctor *Willets* learning. What if *Cappellus* or *H. Brughton*, (who fixeth the

the beginning of the 70. years at *Jehoiakim's* captivity) should have reasoned from Dan. 1. 12, *&c.* In like manner that direct mention is made in that place of *Jehoiakims* captivity, when *Daniel* went away with him? Their reason would be found no lesse valide for the one, then D. *Willets* for the other. The bare mentioning of *Jechonias* captivity can not be a ground of beginning the 70. years thereat.

His third Reason is, because *Jechonias*, and those who were with him, yeelded themselves to the King of Chaldea, and obeyed the counsell of *Jeremiah*, which *Zedekias* refused, and therefore the first are compared unto a Basket of good Figs, the other to a Basket of rotten Figs, Jer. 24. 2. &c. The first Captivitie therefore is to be counted, because therein the Counsell of the Lord was followed.

I see not here, how the consequent can follow upon the antecedent. *Jechonias* and those who were with him yeelded unto *Nebuchadnezar*. Therefore the 70. years should begin at their Captivitie. It seemeth indeed to be *non causa pro causa*.

Howbeit

Howbeit *Jechonia* (in a civile thing which concerneth his own good) gave obedience, for the which he received a temporall reward, 2 Kin. 25. 27. yet his manners were no better then his fathers before him. For, 2 King. 24. 9. it is said, That he did evill in the sight of the Lord, according to all that his fathers had done.

Now as for the Type of Figs Jer. 24. it is nothing to the purpose: For the comparison is betwixt the good and Faithfull People who were carried away, either before *Jechonias* or with him, as may appear by v. 5, 6, 7. unto whom the Lord promised, that he would bring them again into the Land, and give them an heart to serve him; whereas he would execute his Justice against *Zedekiah* and his Princes, &c. in a most severe manner powring out his plagues upon them more fearfully then he had done before, because they being like rottenfigs, were more wicked then any who had gone before them, this maketh rather against *D. Willet*, nor for him, declaring that the 70. years should rather have their beginning at *Zedekiah's* Captivitie, then any other that did preceed.

Willets

Willets fourth Reaſon is, becauſe *Ezechiel* in diverſe places counteth the years from the Captivitie of *Iechonias*, as c. 1.2. c. 8. 1. c. 24. 1. c. 31. 1.

The reaſon why *Ezechiel* counteth from *Iechonias* captivity, is, becauſe then hee was taken away captive himſelf. And therefore c. 40. 1. he calleth it expreſly our captivity. This can be no ſufficient ground for beginning the 70. years thereat; no more then it can be for beginning the ſame at *Iehoiakims* captivity, becauſe *Daniel* reckoneth thereby, Dan. 1. 1, 2. By reaſon that he was then taken away captive himſelf.

His fifth reaſon is, becauſe the captivity of *Iechonias* was moſt famous, both in reſpect of perſons that went into captivity, and their number; for the King himſelf, his mother Princeſſe, and ſervants were then carried away, and the captives were to the number of 10000. 2 King. 24. 14. But in the captivity of *Zedekia* *Jeremiah* ſpeaketh but of 832. perſons taken captive, c. 52. 29. Therefore (ſaith he) from the captivity of *Iechonias*, as the moſt famous, is the count to begin.

Neither

Neither can this reaſon hold; for what howbeit there were manieſt perſons carried away in *Iechonias* captivity, and fewer in the other: that will not prove. Other circumſtances may not be omitted, which are of greater moment. That is, the great number of the ſlain in the city, the burning of it with fire, the laying of the land waſte, and the peoples flying away down to Egypt, *&c.*

Thus having refuted the reaſons in the contrare, I will prove by more valide reaſons, that the count of the 70. years hath the beginning at *Zedekias* captivity.

The firſt I will take from D. *Willets* ſelf, turning his laſt reaſon againſt himſelf. The compt of neceſſity muſt begin at *Zedekia's* captivity, it being moſt famous by reaſon of perſons, numbers of ſlain and fugitives, and other circumſtances. For proving whereof, we muſt underſtand that the ſins of the people of Juda was now waxen to a greater height nor ever of before. There was hitherto ſome hope of remedy, but now there was none. Wickedneſſe had overgone both the Prince and the chief of the Prieſts and people: They tranſgreſſed after all the abominations

nations of the heathen, and polluted the House of Lord; And when the Lord in his compassion, sent messengers unto them, they mocked them, and dispised his words, and misused his Prophets, untill the wrath of the Lord arose against his people till there was no remedie. 2. Chron. 36. from verse 12. till 17.

If in *Jechonia's* captivity the King himself, his mother Princesse, and servants were carried away: Behold here more and worse. *Zedekia's* sons were slain before his eyes, and the Princes of Juda were slain in *Riblah*, his own eyes were put out, and he himself carried unto Babel, untill the day of his death, Jer. 25. 10, 11. The chief Priest and the the second Priest were taken away: read from v. 17. to v. 24. They burnt the house of God and brake down the wall of Jerusalem; and burnt all the pallaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof.

And if the number of captives here were fewer, what marvell, for how many were put to the edge of the sword? 2 Chr. 36. 17. Neither young man, nor virgine, ancient,

nor aged were ſpared: whereas in the other two former captivities, we find not that any were killed. Under tolerance of the Chaldeans, the Jews had their own Kings and ſtill enjoyed their own Civile and Eccleſiaſtick Government. Here, they are all utterly deprived of their Kings, and their Government altogether aboliſhed. Adjoin unto this captivity the Appendix of it, which ſpeedily followed, 2 King. 25. 26. Ierem. 43. 5. when *Gedalia* was ſlain, whom *Nebuchadnezar* had appointed over the remnant of the people, that were left in the land. *Johanan* the ſon of *Carea*, and all the captains of the forces, for fear of the Chaldeans, took men, women and children, and the Kings daughters, and every perſon that *Nebuzaradan* the Captain of the Guard had left, *Jeremiah* the Prophet, and *Baruch* the Scribe, and brought them down to the land of Egypt. Conſider whether or not this conſequent following ſo ſuddenly upon *Zedekia's* captivity, may make the number to exceed the other. For howbeit there were not many carried away to Babel with *Zedekiah*, yet the number of the ſlain in the City

ty and Countrey, and of those who fled into Egypt, was such, as the Land was laid waste.

The second reason I take from those places of Scripture, Levit. 26.43. where this is reckoned as one of the plagues that should come upon the Iews. The land shall be left of them, and shall enjoy her Sabbaths, while she lieth waste without them. And Ier. 25. 11. this whole land shall be desolate and an astonishment, and those Nations shall serve the King of Babel 70. years, and 2 Chron. 36.20. and they that were left by the sword carried he away into Babel, and they were servants to him and to his sons, till the Kingdom of the Persians had rule. v. 21. to fulfill the Word of the LORD by his servant *Jeremiah*, untill the Land had her fill of her Sabbaths: so all the dayes that she lay desolate, she keeped Sabbath to fulfill the 70. years. Those 70. years are answerable unto 70. weeks of years preceeding, in the which are so many Sabbaths, which are reckoned from the beginning of *Sauls* reigne: all the which time either they keeped no Sabbaths, or then for the most part they perfunctoriously kee-

ped them, and in ſhow only, and Dan. 9. 2. I *Daniel* underſtood by books the number of the years, whereof the LORD had ſpoken to *Jeremiah* the Prophet, that he would accompliſh 70. years in the deſolation of Ieruſalem. Then, it was not before, that the 70. years did begin, when Ieruſalem and the reſt of the Land was laid waſte, and enjoyed her Sabbaths: But Ieruſalem and the whole Land was not laid waſt, till *Zedekia's* captivity, neither did the land enjoy her Sabbath till then. The laying of the whole land deſolate, and the 70. years are knit together expreſly, Ier. 25. 11. And *Perkinſe*, in his Introduction, ſaith, that the Land could not enjoy her Sabbaths ſo long as ſhe had Kings, Citizens, Rulers, Prieſts and Labourers to manure the ground; therefore, then ſhould the account of the 70 years begin, and not before.

D. Willet anſwereth that this reaſon concludeth not: For although then there was greater deſolation brought upon the City, yet before, whereas the King and all the principall men, and Artificers were carried away, the City began to be deſolate, and altogether

altogether it was not desolate, no not in the last Captivity, for five years after in the 23. of *Nebuchadnezar* there were 745. Persons carried away, Jer. 52. 30.

This answer is unsufficient. *D. Willet* granteth, that the desolation in *Zedekias* time was greater then that which was before. Good reason hath he to grant this: For it is never said before, that the city was desolate, till now. And howbeit both the Kings, and Nobles, and many others were carried away in the former captivities, yet others were ever set up in their rooms again, and the city never left unpeopled till *Zedekias* time.

He subjoineth that it was not altogether left desolate, no not in the last Captivity, because five years after there were 744. Persons carried away: If he think that those were carried out of the City, he is deceived: For the City before that time was made unhabitabitable, neither doth the Text say that those were carried out of the City, but out of the country: But concerning those I have answered before. And if the Jews had been free of *Zedekias* Captivity,

and the Egyptian desolation that followed upon it, neither their City nor Country had lyen waste. For what was 3023. carried away in the seventh year of *Nebuchadnezzar*, or 10000. in his eight year, or 745. Persons in his 23. year. in regard of the Populousnesse of that Nation, whereof I have spoken before. The taking away of the former few numbers would never have mad the Land desolate, if greater evils had not followed.

3. The third Reason: At this Captivity onely, it is said that Juda, that is, the Kingdome and Tribe of Juda, was carried away in Captivity, we heard before of *Iehoiakims* Captivity, and of *Iechonias* Captivity, but never of Juda's, till this time Jer. 52. 27. 2 King. 25. 21.

4. If the 70. years must begin at the most famous Captivity, then without all controversie, it must take beginning at *Zedekias* Captivity: For it is incomparably the most famous, by reason that there is ten times more spoken in Scripture of it, then of all the rest. In the Prophecie of *Ezechiel* there are whole ten Chapters, to wit from the

the third to the thirteen, all spent upon that Subject, as also his 16. Chapter, and 21. from v. 1. to v. 28. as also his 24. Chapter, and little or nothing is said by *Ezechiel* anent the other Captivities, except that sometimes he counteth from *Iechonias* Captivity, in the which he was carried away himself. Suchlike *Ieremiah* spendeth his whole 21. Chapter in Prophecying to *Zedekiah*, anent his Captivity and destruction of the City. To this same effect is a part of the 19. chap. from v. 16. to v. 24 Neither is there any other thing contained in all the 34. chap. and 39. to v. 11. and c. 52. the Historie thereof is repeated from v. 1. to v. 30. But *Jeremiah* speaketh not so much of the other two preceeding Captivities, nor of the last which followed, no not by many degrees. The like is also done in the second Book of Kings and Chronicles *Zedekias* Captivity is related at more length a great deal then all the rest.

The last reason is most pregnant. The 70. years began with the beginning of the Babyloniſh Impyre. This is undenyable. But the Babyloniſh Impire began not before

Zedekias

Zedekias Captivity. Jer. 25. 11. This whole Land ſhall be deſolate, and an aſtoniſhment, and thoſe nations ſhall ſerve the King of Babel 70. years. The names of thoſe other nations that ſerved the King of Babel are ſet down from v. 19. to 27. Now as this account did not begin till the whole Land of Juda was laid waſte, which came not to paſſe till *Zedekiahs* Captivity, neither were the nations there mentioned, ſubjected to the King of Babel till after *Zedekias* Captivity, as is manifeſt from Jer. 25. c. 26. c. 47. c. 48. and 49. and Ezech. 25 c. 26. c. 27. &c. being compared together where *Iermiah* and *Ezechiel* Prophecie of the deſtruction to follow after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and in particular termes, thoſe 70. years were determined upon Tyrus, Iſa. 23. 15. and 17. But Tyrus was not beſiedged till Jeruſalem was firſt taken and ſacked, For the which Tyrus did rejoice Ezech. 26. 2. and was ſhortly thereafter beſiedged. I know that *Ioſephus* writing againſt *Appion* affirmeth that Tyrus did endure eleven years ſpace before it was taken. At the which if *Ioſephus* hath truely

written

written, The Captivity of Tyrus muſt take the beginning, and the 70. years from thence be reckoned.

Howſoever it is manifeſt that the Babyloniſh Impire did not begin before the time that Jeruſalem was deſtroyed, and Tyrus beſieged. It could not begin in the firſt year of *Nebuchadnezar*, for then he made no conqueſt. The firſt conqueſt that hee made was in the fourth year of his reign, and in the eight of *Iehoiakim*, when the Jews became tributaries to him, as is imported 2 King. 24. 1. three years before *Iehoiakims* Captivity, neither did he proceed in any further degree of conqueſt, till Jeruſalem was deſtroyed: Now his bringing of the Kingdome of Juda, under tribute, could not make up to him a Monarchie, unles that that *Pharao Neho* King of Egypt be alſo accounted a Monarche, unto whom the kingdome of Iuda was tributary, after the death of *Ioſias* untill I*echoiakim* became ſubject to *Nebuchadnezar*. So thoſe three did concurre, the deſtruction of Ieruſalem, the beginning of the 70 years captivitie, and the beginning of the Babploniſh monarchie over

over thoſe nations ſpoken of Ier. 25. &c. and Ezech. 25. &c. For howbeit that impire, had before, a beginning of being: yet till that time, it had no beginning of perfection.

Adde unto the former reaſõnes, that the moſt part begin the 70 years at this roote, howbeit it be oppoſed by many learned Chronologues, but with ſmall reaſon, as I truſt is made manifeſt by the premiſſes.

When the city had been beſieged a yeer and five moneths, that is from the tenth day of the tenth month of the ninth year of *Zedekias* reigne unto the eleventh year, the ninth day of the fourth moneth the city was broken up, Jer. 52. 4, *&c.*

The hiſtory of the breaking up of the city, and burning thereof, and taking of the King, *&c.* is ſet down alſo, 2 King. 25. 2 Chr. 26.

After that the city was taken in the fourth moneth, in the tenth day of the fifth moneth, and 19. of *Nebuchadnezzar*, the Temple and City were burned, and the walls broken down. So the eleventh year of *Zedekia*, and 19. of *Nebuchaedezzar* is to bee reckoned the firſt of the captivity: by reaſon that unto *Zedekiah* it was a broken year, whereof

whereof he had but five moneths only, and the rest of that year, which was the most part, befell to the Chaldeans.

Thereafter *Gedalia* the sone of *Ahikam* was made Governour by *Nebuchadnezar*, over those that remained in the land: but in the seventh moneth, he was slain by *Ishmael* the son of *Nethania*, 2 King. 25. 25. Then all the people, both small and great, and the captains of the army arose and fled into Egypt, for fear of the Chaldeans, v. 2. 6.

In the 23. year of *Nebuchadnezar*, the captain of the guard *Nebuzaradan* returning to Judea, took with him to Babel all that hee found into it, to wit, 745. Jews, Jer. 52. 30. while as the rest before had either perished by the sword, famine, or pestilence, or had fled down to Egypt.

In the 37. year of the captivity of *Iechonia* King of Judah, which was the 26. of *Zedekia's* captivity, in the 12. moneth, the 25. day of the moneth, *Evilmerodah* King of Babell in the first year of his reign, delivered *Iechonia* out of prison, *&c*, Ier. 51. 31.

Thus *Nebuchadnezar* reigned 25. years after the destruction of Jerusalem: and the

rest

reſt of the years of the Babyloniſh Monarchy and Jewiſh Captivity, being 45. in number, remain to be divided betwixt the other two Kings of Chaldea, *Evil-merodah* & *Beltazar*.

Concerning the ending of the former 70. yeares, there needeth not much to be ſpoken. It was only to endure unto the reigne of the Kingdome of Perſia, 2 Chro. 36. 20. And therefore in the firſt year of *Cyrus* was the proclamation given out for relieving the Iewiſh Captivity, and re-edifying of the Temple and City, Ezr. 1. 2, 3. Iſai. 44. 28. and c. 45. 13. Then ſhould the 70. years end, when the King of Babel and the Nation of the Chaldeans ſhould bee puniſhed for their iniquity, and made a perpetuall deſolation, Ier. 25. 12. Then it was that *Daniel* made his prayer, Dan. 9. 2. that the LORD, according to the prophecy of Ieremiah, ch. 29. v. 12, 13, 14. would end the deſolations of Ieruſalem. By deſolations in the plurall number, is meaned all the former captivities, which ſhould end with the 70. years. And whereas many did not return, that was not becauſe of any reſtraint of their liberty, But becauſe of their owne unwilling-

unwillingneſſe, who chooſed rather to remain within the Babyloniſh Dominions among Idolaters, then to return to their own countrey. Concerning the captivity, one hath well obſerved, that it reſembleth the miſerable eſtate of mans life. For as the captivity endured 70. years, ſo the life of man, Pſal. 90. 10. is ſaid to endure 70. yeares, which in like manner is but a captivity, and full of trouble and miſery.

I would not proſecute this purpoſe any further, if I had not been moved thereto by *Cappellus*, who in his Hiſtory at the year of the world, 3481. hath ſet down a diſtinction whereby the former truth, which I have delivered, may be overthrown.

He maketh a twofold 70. years: the one whereof he affirmeth to begin at *Jehoiakim's* captivity, and to end at *Cyrus* his entry to the Perſian Empire, when the Iews were ſet at liberty. The other he beginneth at the eleventh year of *Zedekia*, and endeth at the ſecond year of *Darl Hyſtaſpis*, whom he conceiveth to be the builder of the Temple, Ezr. 6. taking his warrant from Zachar. 1. 12. where the Angel ſaith, *O Lord of hoſts, how long*

long wilt thou not have mercy on Ieruſalem, and on the cities of Iudah, againſt whom thou haſt had indignation theſe threeſcore and ten years? Which 70. years, he affirmeth to be different from the other, contrare to the minde of the beſt Interpreters; But he giveth no reaſon of his affirmation. It might therefore be as eaſily denyed as affirmed. But for further ſatisfaction to the Reader, I will diſprove the ſame by ſufficient reaſons.

1. The Prophet *Ieremiah* never prophecied of twice 70. diverſe years trouble to come upon the Iews, neither can any warrant of ſuch a thing bee drawn from the Text of the Prophet *Zachary*: Why then ſhould that be imagined? If there were twice 70. yeares, why did the Prophet *Ieremiah* diverſe times foretell of the one, but never of the other.

2. How is it that theſe two ſeptuagints of years are ſo coincident, that the former comprehendeth within it fourty and nine years of the latter. For from the firſt of *Cyrus* to the ſecond of *Darius*, *Cappellus* maketh onely 21. years, and the whole reſt falleth within the compaſſe of the former 70. It ſeemeth therefore that he would make it appear that the

the Angel did fail in numbering; for he ſhould rather have ſaid that the Lords wrath againſt Ieruſalem and the cities of Iudah had not hitherto continued 70 years only, but in whole fourſcore and eleven years; for ſo long is the ſpace according to his reckoning betwixt the beginning of *Iehoiakim's* captivity, and the ſecond year of *Darius*, he might as well have ſet down three ſeptuagints of years, or four, according to the number of the captivities. The meaning then of the ſpeach uttered by the Angel is this: O Lord, of hoſts, ſince thou haſt afflicted thy people thoſe 70. years: notwithſtanding that at the end thereof thou promiſed that the Temple ſhould be built, how is it that they are ſtill afflicted by their enemies, and thy promiſe not accompliſhed, but the work hindered? For the building of the Temple was begun before that time in the reigne of *Cyrus*, but not perfited. I will end therefore with that which *Gualter*, both a Theologue and Chronologue, in his time, not a litle reſpected; hath left written upon the place of *Zachary*.

The Angel, ſaith he, mentioneth the 70. years,

years, not that they were finally accomplished in the second year of *Darius*, which is believed by some being deceived by the fables of the Iews, but that he might show that his intercession was just and agreeable to the LORDS promise; and therefore the LORD should not despise the same.

It followeth next, that the Iubilies of the former two Periods be orderly set downe, whereby it will further appear that the marches of both are rightly fixed.

The ninth Iubilie before, ended in King *Salomons* eleventh year, when the building of the Temple was finished, from the which, to the end of the Babylonish Captivity, are 490. years, that is, ten Iubilies which follow after this manner.

	10	3		*Abia.*
	11	8		*Fosaphat.*
	12	18		*Foas.*
	13	27		*Amazia.*
	14	47		*Uzia.*
Iubilie	15	ends the 12	year of	*Ezekia.*
	16	32		*Manasses.*
	17	24		*Fosias.*
	18	31		*Zedekiah,*

and

and 39 of *Nebuchadnezzar*

19 In the last year of the Captivity partly, and first of the Persian Empire.

Hereby it appeareth that thir Jubilies are rightly set in order; because they agree directly with the Textuall numbers of years before set down. But *Alstedius* and *Cappellus* have both missed in this decade. *Alstedius* casteth the last year of the fifteenth Jubilie in the 13. of *Ezekia*. And *Cappellus* setteth the same in the 14. year of his raigne, whereas it befalleth neither in the one nor the other, but directly in the 12. according to the just number of the years, being orderly reckoned.

The same is also proven by reason, In the 14 year of *Hezekia*, *Senacherib* sent his host against Jerusalem 2 King. 18. 13. Isai. 36. 1. The Prophet *Isaiah* giveth this signe to *Hezekia*, and his people of their delivery, Isai. 37. 30. That they eat one year, that is, they had eaten one year, such things as grew of themselves, and in the second year, that which springeth of the same. And in the third year sow ye, and reap, and plant

Vineyards. &c. according to the Law of the Sabbatticall year mentioned Lev. 25 21, 22. And so *Junius* 2 King. 19. 29. translateth it out of the Hebrew. *Anno uno*, and not *anno primo*, as doth *Montanus*.

The signe then is this, let the plenty wherewith through the Providence of God ye have been furnished without labour, the two years bygone, notwithstanding your bordering enemies, confirm you in believing the promise of your liberty and tranquility which presently ye are to enjoy. And this same did come to passe in the third year following the Jubilie inclusive, which was the fourteen of *Hezekiah*. When the siedge of the city was raised, and the Chaldeans overthrown and put back. Here the English translation strayeth from the native sense. For the reading should be after this manner, v. 29. And this shall be a sign unto thee, ye eat or have eaten one year such things as have grown of themselves and in the second year that which springeth of the same. And in the third year sow ye and reap, &c. laying aside all fear of your enemies.

There-

Therefore neither the 13. nor the 14. year of *Hezekia*, but the 12. both according to the just count of years, and according to reason, was the last year of the 15. Jubilie.

Suchlike in this reckoning, the tenth year of *Zedekia* falleth to be the fourth sabbaticall year of the 18. Jubilie, contrary unto those who make it to fall in the eighth or eleventh year, For in the tenth year of *Zedekia's* reign, it was, that he proclamed liberty for the servants, according to the Law of the sabbaticall year, Deut. 15. 12. King *Zedekia* Jer. 34. 8. had caused this year their Liberty to be proclamed, that by this sign of the Jews repentance, the Lords wrath might be averted, the Chaldeans now lying in siege about the City, but the enemies leaving the siege for a little space, because of the Egyptians comming to help the Jews Ier. 37. 5. then treacherously they recalled their servants to their service whom they had newly before set at liberty. Upon the which occasion, *Ieremiah* Prophecied against the Iews, that the Chaldeans should shortly return, and renew the siege against the

City, which alſo they did, and ceaſed not till they had ruinated the ſame.

By thoſe things which hath been ſaid anent the twelfth year of *Hezekiah*, and the tenth of *Zedekia*, whereof the firſt is a Iubilie, the other a ſimple ſabbaticall year, it is an eaſie thing by reckoning to demonſtrat, how far the whole count by the Iubilies of 50. ſtray from the right calculation.

The ſeventh and laſt Periode.

Queſtion firſt.

Concerning the Neceſsity and Utility of Daniels 70. weeks, and difficulty thereof.

THe Neceſſity of the knowledge of that Prophecy contained in the end of the ninth chapter of *Daniel*, is of exceeding great conſequence; *John Rainolds*, whom *Polanus* calleth the moſt learned of the Engliſh, ſaith that the controverſie of *Daniels* weeks, is of ſo great weight, that it comprehendeth the chief Miſtery of Chriſtian Religion, and of ſuch difficulty, that it hath exerciſed the moſt Excellent Ingines Prelect. 130. upon the Apocripha Books. The

The Jews call that Prophecy, the Pillar of Christian Religion, and so it may well be called: For in it is contained the summe and substance thereof, neither is there any surer ground in all the Old Testament of our Salvation, of which the Prophets have enquired, and searched diligently who Prophecied of that Grace that should come unto us, searching what, and in what manner of time the Spirit of CHRIST that was in them did signifie, when it testified before hand the sufferings of CHRIST, and the Glory that should follow, 1 Pet. 1. 10, 11.

Within the compasse of those weeks, is comprehended the whole time of the Persian and Grecian, with a part of the Roman Monarchy: And as the understanding of the Histories of those three, serveth not a little, for attaining to the knowledge of that Prophecy: so the right opening up thereof maketh much for the clearing of the Histories of those times, especially so far as the monarchies had any medling with Christs Kirk.

The Knowledge of that Prophecy may be helpfull for the understanding of much

Scripture, that commeth within the compasse thereof, as namely the Historie of *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, and *Ester*, much of the Prophecy of *Daniel*, the Prophecies of *Haggai*, *Zechariah*, and *Malachie*, the Prophecies of *Ezechiel* from Chap. 34. to the end, was accomplished within this time: Within it also commeth the acount of the Apocriph Books of *Maccabees* and others, and that which is chief of all, the Historie of the Birth, Life, and Death of our Saviour, comprehended in the four Gospels, as also the Historie of the Acts of the Apostles, howbeit it be not within the account of the 70. weeks.

The controversie anent those weeks, as it is the most celebrious in all the Old Testament: even so it is acknowledged by those who have medled therewith, to be most perplexed and difficile. The greatest difficulty is about the beginning and ending thereof, in the first seven weeks, and somewhat after, till near the midst of the Persian Empire, and in the ending of those 70. weeks, about the last week or half week.

The cause of the former difficultie are diverse,

verse, and they concern either the Jewes or Christians. The main cause of the Jewes erring, is their ignorance and contempt of humane literature. It is found by experience that the knowledge of Languages, Histories, Arts and Sciences doth much conduce for opening up of Scripture, and clearing hard places thereof. But the Jews contemne all sort of forraign Learning; what marvell is it that the Scriptures be obscure unto them, and hard to be understood?

A certain Jew upon a time demanded of one of their Rabbies, If he might safely read the books of Ethnick Writers: unto whom the Rabbi answered that he might do it without danger, providing that he did the same neither by day nor by night.

On the other part again, The thing that maketh those weeks obscure and hard to Christians, is their too much adhering unto forraign Learning: as the Histories of Ethnicks, and the Writs of Men, who erre often, not only in corrupt reckoning of times, but also contradict one another in most substantiall and materiall points.

Hereby the knowledge of the 70. weeks is greatly

greatly darkened, while as they labour to make their account to agree with the Grecian account of the Olympiades, and Chaldean account of the Celeſtiall Eccliplſes ſet down by Aſtronomers: both whereof are moſt uncertain; Howbeit I diſaſſent not from thoſe who think that the Olympick reckoning may be admitted in computation of the time of the Greek Empire, but not of the preceeding time. But I have ſet down before what I eſteem of both thoſe.

This I adde further, that it is no marvell that there be great errour and difficulty in handling of thoſe Hepdomades; For they have not only ſtrayed from the Scriptures, but alſo from the Greek Hiſtorians, agreeing therewith both in the names and order of the Perſian Kings. It is well obſerved by *Scaliger*, in his ſixth book of Emendation of times, that the Scripture deduceth the Perſian Kings after the ſame manner that the Greeks do, as is evident by comparing their writs with Dan. 11. 2. and the book of *Ezra* throughout. It is a pitifull thing to ſee how they have perverted the ſtate of the Perſian Empire, and the Kings thereof. The Hebrews

Hebrews reckon but four or five Kings of Persia: The Latines exceed as far as the Hebrewes are deficient. Both writers were posterior to the age of the Persian Empire the space of 4, 5, or 6. hundreth years, whereas the Greeks, *Zenophon*, *Herodotus*, and *Clesias* lived in the time thereof, and *Clesias* was in the court of *Artaxerxes Memor*, and being a Phisician, healed him of a disease. Yea, those might well have been acquainted with *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, and other Jews in the Persian Court.

Some confound *Darius Histaspis* the third King of Persia, with *Nothus* the sixth. Some confound *Darius Nothus* With *Darius Codomanus* the tenth. In like manner they confound the two *Artaxerxes* to wit *Artax. Longimanus* the fifth King with *Artax. Memor* the seventh, ascribing unto the former two those things that are proper to the latter, by reason of the identitie of names. They attribute unto the Antecessors that which belongeth to the Successors, even as *Herodotus* and *Trogus* fathereth upon *Ninus* and *Semiramis* his Queen, the Acts of their Posterity. Some again confound the

first

first *Artaxerxes* with *Assuerus* and the second with *Darius* of whom *Scaliger* saith, *Monstrum nobis bicorpor compegerunt.* They have made up unto us a twobodied Monster. But others have done worse, confounding three Kings of Persia, to wit, *Darius Nothus* and *Artaxarxes Memor*, and this *Darius*. *Artarxerxes* (say they) was *Longimanus* the Finisher of the Temple.

This is indeed *monstrosa tricorporis umbræ Forma.* A monstrous shape of a three-bodyed shaddow. I did complaine before of the failing of the Latines, through too much declining toward humane learning: but those grosse and foggie mists of errour are risen through the too great ignorance both of sacred and humane literature, which must be scattered by both, but especially by the Golden Rayes of Gods Word it self.

Question second.

Anent the names and number of the Persian Kings, and uncertainty of their reign, and continuance of their Empire.

I Will not here trouble the Reader either with the defective or superfluous number of

of the Kings of Persia, which may easily be had from others. Only anent the latter, I will subjoin that which *Scaliger* pertinently hath uttered, to wit that they have not only fained a new kingdome, but also new Kings of Persia.

Of all others, the Greek Historianes have best set down both the number and names of the Kings of Persia, and in most distinct order, howbeit they fail in setting down of the years.

1 *Cyrus*	6 *Darius Nothus.*
2 *Cambyses*	7 *Artaxerxes memor*
3 *Darius Histaspis*	8 *Ochus.*
4 *Xerxes*	9 *Arses or Arsamus.*
5 *Artaxerxes Longimanus*	10 *Dar. Codomanus*

Junius, *Cappellus*, *Melanchton*, *Scaliger*, and *Polanus* have them in the same manner: But the first two insert *Smerdes Magus*, whom the other omitteth. For he was a treacherous usurper of the Kingdome, and is neither acknowledged by the Scripture it self, neither is he worthy to be reckoned among the Kings of Persia, he continued but seven moneths, and was cut off by *Dar. Histaspis*, and the rest of the Princes of Persia

Persia. *Scaliger* omitteth *Arses* or *Arsames* the penult King of Persia.

All those Kings are demonstrate from Scripture, except *Ochus* and *Arses*, who are not mentioned in it.

The first four, from *Darius* the Mede, to *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, are mentioned Dan. 11. 2. There are three set before *Xerxes* the Potent, and rich King of Persia, who stirred up the nations subject unto him, against Grecia: He is there so clearly described as if he were pointed at with the finger. The other three who preceeded him, are 1. *Cyrus* who is every where mentioned in the Book of *Ezra*, next his son *Cambyses*, and *Dar. Histasp.* But heir *Smerdes Magus* otherwise called *Sphendatates* is omitted: If he had been here reckoned, there had not been three but four Kings before *Xerxes*. *Cambyses* is also mentioned before Dan. 10. 23. under the name of the Prince of Persia. And *Dar. Histasp.* Ezra. 4. 5. *Xerxes* under the name of *Asuerus*, is to be found every where in the Book of *Ester* and Ezra 4. 6. *Artax. Longimanus* is named Ezra. 4. 7. and through the rest of the Chapter to the

the end, neither is he ever mentioned in Scripture (either before or hereafter) what soever diverse others say in the contrare. *Darius Nothus* is often mentioned, Ezra c. 5. and 6. Zech. 1. and Haggai 1.

Artaxerxe Mnemon Ezr. 7. and often in the Historie of *Nehemiah*. *Darius* the last Nehem. 12. 22.

Concerning the continuance of the Persian Monarchie, there are diverse opinions each one differing from another. So great is the uncertainty thereof. I rest upon *Beroaldus*, *Hew Brughton*, and *Willets* opinion agreeing together, that the Persian Monarchy did not endure above 130. years. To the which also assenteth *Junius* in his first Edition, which I prefer to the last. This doubtlesse is the truth and most agreeable to the Scripture it self.

There is no lesse diversity of opinions anent the reign of their Kings, and the particular time thereof. *A. Willet* upon his Commentary upon Dan. 6. setteth down eight severall opinions concerning the reign of *Cyrus*, five or six anent the reign of *Cambyses*, eight of the reign of *Darius Histaspis*.

pis: and so furth of the rest, so that betwixt the greatest, and the smallest number of the years, of the Kings of Persia joined together, there will be eighty years. And to this purpose he citeth *Burgensis*, complaining that the Historians of the Medes and Persians are full of diversities, and contradictions, insomuch that they do not onely varie in the continuance of some Kings, but some Histories also name some Kings that others mentioneth not at all.

Question third.

Why this term of 490. years is expressed by weeks.

THe seventh number was of great observation among the Jews, as is to be seen every where in holy writ. The seventh day, the seventh year, the seventh seventh year: which was the Jubilie year in the 49. Yea the Ethnicks had a singular respect unto the seventh number, as is to be seen in Balam the sorcerer, Num. 23. 1. Therefore to signifie the great year of rest and Jubilie at the comming of the Messiah, when there should

should be a generall Remission of the sins of the world, this time is reckoned by weeks and by seven times ten weeks which make ten Jubilies. 2. Another reason is this: The Angel would compare the 70. weeks of years with the 70. years of Captivity, shewing that for 70. years of Captivity, they should enjoy seven times 70. years of deliverance, the Grace and Mercy of God being Compared with his Judgements.

Question fourth.

The 70. weeks signifie not an uncertain, and indefinite, but a certain and definite number of years.

SOme are of that minde, that by the number of *Daniels* weeks, there is not signified a precise terme of years, but generally all that time, which should follow unto the comming of the Messiah. But this opinion is disproven by diverse good reasons.

1. The number of years whose beginning and ending is expresly set down, must needs be a definite and certain number, being so bounded and limited: For what number

can

can be certain, if such a number be not certain? But the beginning and end of this terme is so described. They take their beginning at the going forth of the word. Dan. 9. 23, 24, 25, &c. and end at the death of the Messiah.

2. The manner of Phrase declareth as much 70. weeks are cut out or determined, that is exactly, and by a rule determined, and precisely bounded by the Eternall Counsell of God, so that neither fewer nor mo years are to be understood: So the Angel confirmeth the Prophet anent the certainty of time, which was not to be changed by any creature, since it was cut out, and unchangeably determined by him, unto whom onely it appertaines, to determine by an unviolable, and immutable Law. Those are *Polanus* own words, translated out of his Commentary on Dan. 9.

3. That number is certain and definite, which is divided into certain parts, the years of every part whereof are definitely and determinately expressed: But so is the whole number of the weeks: It is divided in three parts, the first whereof hath seven weeks the second 62. and the third one week.

4. This number of 70. weeks answereth unto the terme of 70. years, being that same number seven times multiplied: Therefore as the one is certain so is the other.

5. The rest of the larger Periodes from the beginning of the world hitherto, are certainly limited and determined, both in regard of their beginning, and their end, as hath been formerly shown.

In like manner must the 70. weeks be. For what reason can be given, wherefore the other preceeding larger Periodes should be certainly bounded and determined, and this only should be left unbounded and unlimited?

6. That Periode of time which is reckoned by Jubilies, is certain and definite: For every Jubilie is a definite time of forty nine years: But the 70. weeks are to bee reckoned by Jubilies: For they as a water course, never stay till they carry us unto Christ. This Argument is of no lesse force then any of the former.

Queſtion fifth.
Rainolds reaſons which he bringeth in the contrare are refuted.

NOtwithſtanding that the former Doctrine is maintained as a truth by the beſt Divines, and Chronologues that I have ſeen, yet it is oppoſed by that great Divine *John Rainolds*, who in his Prelections upon the Apocriph Books, hath ſpent 28. of them upon Daniels weeks, in the moſt part whereof he ſetteth himſelf againſt, *H. Brughton*, whom he nameth not, but calleth him the Author of the conſent: And yet he hath written more ſoundly in diverſe points, concerning the 70. weeks nor ſundry others. It ſeemeth by his Prelections that he hath been ſomewhat commoved againſt *H. Brughton*, which hath made him to diſpute as appeareth, rather for the victory then for the verity.

In the mean time, I marvell that ſo learned a man ſhould uſe ſo weak reaſons. He is followed by *William Pemble* his Abridger in the third Chapter of his Chronologie of the

the Persian Empire. Both those affirme that *Daniels* 70. weeks signifie an uncertain time, and that they are put Synedochically for the whole time from the going out of *Cyrus* edict, for delivery of the people of Israel from Captivity, to the Death of Christ, which they alleadge to be 560. years, giving unto the Persian Empire 200. of them.

Before that I descend unto their particular reasons, I must first examine their conclusion, which they intend to prove.

They are not far out of purpose in setting down the beginning of the 70. weeks: For it is like, that there was but small distance betwixt the going out of the Commandement unto the Angel *Gabriel* anent the 70. weeks, Dan. 9. 23. which is the just beginning thereof, and *Cyrus* Proclamation anent the peoples Libertie: They end the same also rightly at the Death of our Saviour. But, even in the beginning, they admit a contradiction: For they say that the time betwixt the beginning and ending of those weeks is uncertain, and yet they determine it to be 560. years, If it be uncertain, it can

not be 560. years. If it be 560. years, it cannot be uncertain.

2. By this account Christs death shall not befall in a Jubilie: For 560. years are not ten Jubilies, which is the just account but eleven, and 21. years more.

3. They do in vain draw from the Text of Daniel a Synecdoche: For it importeth no such thing. And according to the Rules of Rhetorick, it is well said by *Alstedius* in his Lexicon. *Verba sunt intelligenda secundum ipsorum proprietatem nisi cogamur aliter evidenti absurdo.* Words are to bee understood in their proper sense, unlesse we be constrained by an evident absurditie to do otherwayes.

Let us next ponder the particular reasons whereby they intend to prove that the former 70. weeks signifie an uncertain time. I will prosecute them as *Pemble* hath abridged them.

1. Numbers (saith he) are either taken properly, when they note that which naturally they signifie; or improperly or figuratively, when they signifie more or lesse in regard of the circumstance of matter and the

the ſpeakers intention. Of thoſe numbers he ſetteth down certain examples, and concludeth, that often in Scriptures numbers finite are put for infinite, round or groſſe for corrupt, or rather broken.

All this is true, but according to the the firſt branch of the diviſion, there are moe numbers by a hundreth to one, taken in Scripture properly nor improperly, of the which kinde we muſt rather Judge *Daniels* weeks to be, according to the reaſons before mentioned, unleſſe they prove the contrare, which I judge, cannot eaſily be done. I needed therefore to give no other anſwer unto their particular examples which they bring to prove their concluſion, but this. A More is black, It will not therefore follow, that a French, Scots, or Engliſh man, is alſo black. It can have no better conſequence then to ſay, That becauſe there are ſome numbers in Scripture taken Synecdochically, therefore alſo the 70. weeks are of that kinde.

Beſide this, *Pemble*, in the firſt example, which is anent the beginning of the 70. years Captivity, contradicteth himſelf: For in

the forementioned Chapter which he hath anent the Chronologie of the Persian Monarchy, he affirmeth that the 70. years Captivity in Babylon, did take their beginning in the reign of *Jehoiakim*: But in his Exposition of the first of *Zechariah*, he acknowledgeth that it beginneth best of all at the 11. year of *Zedekia*, and the 19. of *Nebuchadnezar*; when the Temple and City, and all were ruined, which is the truth; And herein *Pemble* justly forsaketh *Rainolds* his guide, and conveniently in the margin Citeth to his purpose. Sir *Walter Ralies* Historie, lib. 3. c. 1. sect. 3.

2. They say that the drift and scope of the Angels speach showeth, that this is spoken by way of allusion to the 70. years Captivity, to shew that GodsMercy should exceed his Judgments seventy times, which from that time should endure seventy times seven years, till the comming of Christ and afterwards for ever. It is therefore a Propheticall prediction, and not an Historicall relation: And the circumscription of time, is used onely for memories sake, that after those many years, they should be sure to obtain

tain such a deliverance, as then which, they could desire nothing more.

It is true, that the speach of the Angel, is by way of allusion, and Propheticall, and historicall: But how doth it follow that therefore the time is uncertain? when the people of Israel had murmured against *Moses* and *Aaron*, after the return of the Spyes, who were sent out to view the Land of Canaan, Num. 14. 34. The Lord spake unto *Moses* in this manner, *After the number of the dayes in the which ye searched the Land even* 40. *dayes, each day for a year, shall ye bear your iniquities, even* 40. *years.* This speach is uttered by way of allusion, and is Propheticall, and not historicall, and yet I beleeve that they will not affirme the number of years heer mentioned, to be uncertain. The like is Ezech. 4. 4. *&c.* Neither is the circumscription of time onely used for memories cause, as they imagine, but also for information of the minde, anent the certain time insewing to the death of Christ, and to stir up the hearts and affections of the Jews, to take hold of the Spiritual delivery, which then was to be accomplished

pliſhed, and to endure hereafter for ever.

3. From Gen. 15. 13. Know for a ſurety, that thy ſeed ſhall be a ſtranger in a land not theirs 400. years. They affirme that this count cannot hold preciſely, but muſt be underſtood Synecdochically. If it ſhould be granted, which is alleadged, what is it to the purpoſe? It toucheth not *Daniels* weeks. They do in this matter as *Jeſſe* did. 1. Sam. 16. he brought all his ſeven ſons one by one to *Samuel*, but not *David* who ſhould be anointed. they bring out ſundry places of Scripture, but the thing that is controverted is not proven. I have before ſufficiently ſpoken what is needfull, concerning thoſe four hundreth years in the third Periode, unto the which the reader may return, if it be needfull.

4. From *Abraham* to *David* are 14. Generations; Mat. 1. 17. From *David* to the Captivity 14. Generations &c. Not preciſely fourteen in all. No, from *David* to to the Captivity were 17. again, Chriſt did not preciſely ly three dayes, and three nights in the grave Mat. 12. 40. I anſwer that both thoſe are altogether impertinent,

and

and not ſerving to the purpoſe: This is to give a ſtone for bread.

5. If the Angel (ſay they) had ſaid the 70. years of your Captivity at Babylon are now ended: But after 80. times 7. years Chriſt ſhall be ſlain, and ſo you ſhall obtain a more glorious freedome: Then had the Angell ſpoken preciſely.

If the Angel had not mentioned 490. years but 80. times ſeven years, he had not ſpoken preciſely, but too looſly and widely, exceeding the juſt number of 70. years. I have ſhowen already how *Polanus* hath obſerved the preciſeneſſe of the Angels ſpeach in ſetting down the 490. years, and more I am to ſpeak of the ſame hereafter.

6. The next place of Scripture which *Rainolds* and *Pemble* bringeth, is from *Daniel* 7. *Antiochus* perſecution continued 3. years and an halfe preciſely. Now *Antiochus* was a type of ſathan, therefore the time, times, and a half a time. 42. moneths. 1260 dayes all making up the ſame number of years, are uttered by S. John Apoc. 11. in alluſion to *Antiochus* perſecution. *&c.*

Howbeit they ſhould produce 20. other ſuch

ſuch places of Scripture, yet all is to no purpoſe: They ever miſſe the Mark.

7. That the 70. weeks are not to be taken preciſely, is proven from v. 27. where it is ſaid, that in the middle of the week he ſhall cauſe the ſacrifice and oblation to ceaſe. Then the reaſon ſtands, if CHRIST died in the midſt of the laſt week: From the firſt year of *Cyrus* to the Death of CHRIST are not preciſely 490. years, but 486. and a halfe. the reaſon of the conſequence is plaine.

This Reaſon onely ſeemeth to have ſome weight with it.

For anſwer, It is not ſaid that Chriſt died in the midſt of the laſt week, but that in the middle thereof he ſhall cauſe the ſacrifice and oblation to ceaſe, which ceaſed even in ſome meaſure before his Death, when John Baptiſt began to preach, Mat. 11. 12.

It is ſaid by Chriſt, that from the dayes of John Baptiſt, untill now, the Kingdom of Heaven ſuffereth violence: For all the Law, and the Prophets prophecied untill John.

Upon the which place *Calvin* noteth that Johns

Johns Miniſtery was the Rudiments of the Goſpel. And *Muſculus* ſaith, that he rendereth a reaſon of that which he ſaid: That from the preaching of John Baptiſt, the Kingdome of Heaven ſuffereth violence: Becauſe now he ſhoweth that the time is preſent of the which the Law and the Prophets did foretell. That the time of Pedagogie, of Types and Shaddows, the time of Propheciesand expectation of thoſe th ngs which were foretold by the Prophets, was expired. So even in John Baptiſts time, the Ceremonies and Sacrifices did ceaſe in ſome meaſure.

Calvin upon thoſe words John 4. 23. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true Worſhippers ſhall worſhip the Father in Spirit and in Truth: Telleth us, that when he ſaith, that the hour now is, he putteth an end to the Ceremonies, and ſo he warneth that the time of correction, mentioned Heb. 9. 10. was fulfilled.

The aboliſhing of the Law was not a tranſient, but a continued Act, and was accompliſhed peece and peece. 1. By John Baptiſts, and Chriſts Miniſtery, it was aboliſhed in regard of account and eſtimation.

For

For doubtleſſe the well affected Jews hearing John Baptiſt, and Chriſt Preach the Goſpel, and underſtanding him to be the Meſſiah, and ſeeing Baptiſme Adminiſtrate, which is the firſt Sacrament of the New Teſtament, had not thereafter the legall Ceremonies in ſuch requeſt, as of before, howbeit they did not omit them till after the death of Chriſt, by the which they were aboliſhed, *Jure*, by right, but not *Facto*, by Deed, till 40. years after the deſtruction of the City and Temple.

A man firſt ſickeneth, then he dyeth, then he is buryed; So the Legall Ceremonies and Sacrfices firſt began to wax ſick, at the Miniſtery and Preaching of Chriſt: At his death, they became *Mortua* Dead; After the deſtruction of the Temple, they became *Mortifera*, Deadly: whereas from the Death of Chriſt till that time, they were indifferent. They fail then, who think that either Chriſt died in the midſt of the week, or that the Legall Ceremonies were in no degree aboliſhed before his Death.

For that which is diſannulled and waxed old, is ready to evaniſh Heb. 8. 13. That is,

is, it doth not evaniſh at an inſtant, but ſucceſſively, and by little and little: So ſpeaketh the Apoſtle of the old Covenant.

Their laſt reaſon they take from the Text it ſelf, Dan. 2. 25. In this manner, ſeven weeks are ſaid to paſſe before the building of the ſtreet and wall. But before the building of the ſtreet and wall, there paſſed above 49. years. Therefore by thoſe ſeven weeks moe years are meaned, then are preciſely ſet down.

This Argument is proſecuted by *Rainolds* in his 130. Prelection throughout. But I anſwer, That the thing which is alleadged, is not to be found in the Text. It is not ſaid that 7. weeks muſt paſſe before the building of the ſtreet and wall; For there are both 7. weeks and 62. weeks mentioned, before the building of the ſtreet and wall be ſpoken of. And the building of the ſtreet and wall is immediatly ſubjoined, not to the 7. but to the 62. weeks, within the compaſſe whereof, the ſame was accompliſhed, Nehem. chap. 2. Only the Angel, after he hath mentioned the 62. weeks, he ſubjoineth, The ſtreet ſhall be built again, and the wall

in

in moſt troubleſome times. But *Ezra* firſt determineth more particularly when the Temple was built, and conſequently the City, Ezr. 3. 8. c. 4. 24. and 6. v. 15. And Nehemiah c. 2. telleth when the ſtreet and wall were built, to wit, within the compaſſe of the 62. weeks, in the 20. year of *Artaxerxes*.

I conclude then, that the time of the 70. weeks is not to be taken ſynecdochically or indefinitely, but ſimply, properly or definitely.

QUESTION SIXTH.

The particular time of the beginning of the 70. weeks is determined, and the reaſons brought in the contrare, anſwered.

IT followeth next in order that it be diſcuſſed at what time thoſe 70. weeks take their beginning: neither will I trouble the Reader, with relateing the diverſe opinions that are ſet down by others anent this ſubject.

Jerome writting upon Dan. 9. telleth us, that thoſe weeks begin from the day that the Angel ſpake to *Daniel*: But that was at the time

time of *Daniel's* prayer before *Cyrus* edict. For if *Cyrus* edict anent the peoples delivery had come out before this time, it had been needleſſe for *Daniel* to have prayed for that which was already granted. *Euſebius* alſo cited by *Jerome* beginneth from the ſpeach of the Angel unto *Daniel*, ſaying, From the going out of the Word, *&c.*

It ſeemeth to me a thing moſt plain, that the weeks have their beginning at no edict of any of the Kings of Perſia, but at the Lords own Commandement, given to the Angel to reveal thoſe things unto the Prophet *Daniel*: For v. 23. the Angel ſaith after this manner: At the beginning of thy ſupplications the Commandement came forth, and I am come to ſhew thee *&c.* That is as *Junius* expondeth it. When thou began to pray, I received a Commandement from God that I ſhould anſwer thee. With the which directly agreeth the words uttered by the Angel v. 25. Know therefore and underſtand, that from the going forth of the Commandement of bringing again the people, and of the building of Jeruſalem. For ſo it is to be Red: Of the bringing

bringing again of the People, and of the building of Jeruſalem: According as *Junius*, *Polanus*, *H. Brughton*, and *Cappellus* Tranſlateth it, *De reducendo populo & ædificando*: And not *ad reducendnm & ædificandum.* as *Arr. Montanus* Tranſlateth, whom the Engliſh followeth. For the Angel declared unto *Daniel* Gods Commandement of bringing again the people, and of the building of Jeruſalem: not to bring again the people, *&c.*

The Lords Commandement unto the Angel, was that he ſhould declare unto *Daniel*, that the bringing again of the People, and the building of Jeruſalem was ſhortly to follow.

That which is ſet down v. 25. is an explication of the generall preceeding Prophecy as *Polanus* obſerveth, and the word wherefore, importeth. With this that I have ſaid, agreeth the place Ezra 6. 14. They builded and finiſhed the Temple, according to the Commandement of the God of Iſrael, to wit, given to the Angel *Gabriel*, as hath been ſaid (For God gave no Commandement unto any of the kings of Perſia)

and

and according to the commandement of *Cyrus*, whose spirit the Lord stirred up, 2 Chron. 36. 22. and *Darius* and *Artaxerxes* Kings of Persia. Therefore the 70. weeks begin at the Commandement of God himself, and not at a commendement of any of the Kings of Persia. The Lords own Commandement is first in order, first in time, first in honour, and of largest extent: For the Commandement given to the Angel, to be revealed to the Prophet *Daniel*, includeth the whole future estate to the destruction of Jerusalem, which was successively to be accomplished, and not at the Commandement, or in the time of any one of the Kings of Persia: No not in the time of the whole Persian, or Greek Empire. For that which was of gteatest importance, to wit, the Life, and Death of our Saviour, and the destruction of Jerusalem, was brought to passe under the Roman Empire.

Rainolds Prelect 127. upon the Apocryph books both acknowledgeth and proveth this exposition to be neareſt to the Hebrew. Nevertheless he objecteth against it, but yet doubtingly, and with a *fortasse*. Perhaps,

ſaith he, it is true which *Oecolampadius* anſwereth, who expoundeth after this manner. The word or commandement is gone forth, that is, it is as certainly decreed and conſtituted of God, as if in effect it were done.

But as this expoſition is doubtingly delivered, even ſo it agreeth not with the Text. For it is not ſaid, That the word or commandement is gone forth. But from the going out of the commandement, *&c.* the Propoſition noteth the *terminus à quo*, which can not without a great abſurdity be referred to the Lords Decree in his eternall counſel, how impertinent a thing were it to ſay: That 70. weeks were to paſſe from the Lords Decree in his eternall counſell to the Meſſiah? The words note a preſent commandement, which is not called a decree, but comming forth of the commandement.

That which *Rainolds* ſubjoineth thereafter Prelect 128. is no leſſe impertinent, howbeit (ſaith he) it ſeemeth to me to be moſt agreeable to reaſon, that the word be eſtimat to ſignify that which *Gabriel* recordeth in the former verſes. The word of God and his decree: yet becauſe it may be referred to that

that time, in the which the thing it self was to be fulfilled, and not unto that in the which it was first pronounced; let it therefore be left free unto us to judge that the time might be designed, in the which *Cyrus* was to give liberty to the Jewes to return from the Babylonish captivity. As often as wee see in Scripture those things pronounced by the LORD to be decreed, which are to be perfited in the fulnesse of time, as the Apostle saith, that is in the own time.

Against this exposition I reply three things. 1. It everteth that exposition which before was borrowed from *Oecolampadius*. For if according to *Oecolampadius*, the word signify not the execution of the decree, but the decree it self: then this exposition which is anent the execution of the decree, can not subsist: for the one of those overturneth the other.

2. If the execution of the decree be here meaned, then it is not *Cyrus* commandement anent the delivery of the people, *&c.* For there is not a word of such a thing in the Text, but of the LORDS own commandement. 3. If here the time be designed in

the which *Cyrus* gave liberty to the Jewes to return, then all *Rainolds* large Disputs anent the uncertainty of the beginning of the 70. weeks, and the length of the Persian Empire, above 200. years, supported by the Olympick and Chaldean account, must fall to the ground. And finally, by this, *Rainolds* plainly yeeldeth to *H. B.* following *Beroaldus*, whom at so great length hereafter he oppugneth. For the same cause it is, that *Cappellus* in his twofold History at the year of the World 3543. justly taxeth him.

Notwithstanding that *Rainolds* seemeth to have yeelded to the former exposition anent the beginning of the 70. weeks: yet there are two things which he opposeth against the same. 1. That the time of the beginning thereof is uncertain. And of this I have spoken already, and am to speak somewhat hereafter. Another is, that the Persian Impire, according to the common opinion, continued above 200. years, which he gathereth by the time of the reigne of the Kings of Persia, and the Olympiads. The which if it hold, the 70. weeks can not begin at the pronouncing of the decree, by the Angell

Gabriel:

Gabriel: for it is maintained by Historians and Chronologues that the Greek Impire endured 300. years, and the Roman Impire, from thence to the death of CHRIST 60. years. Either then must the Persian Monarchy losse 70. years of the alleadged 200. or then the 70. weeks cannot take their beginning from the former commandement. *Rainolds* then syllogizeth after this manner.

That which all approven and grave Historians, with common consent, affirme, is certainly true.

But all approven and grave Historians, with common consent, affirme, that the Persian Monarchy indured, from *Cyrus* to *Darius*, above 200. years.

It is therefore certainly true that the Persian Monarchie indured above 200. years.

The prepositon is undoubtedly true: but before I speak of the assumption, it would be observed that it is sufficient to know and hold that the 70. weeks are a definite number of 490. years, taking their beginning from the going out of the commandement, Daniel 9. 23. and ending at the death of

CHRIST; Howbeit we know not determinatly either the preciſe time of the continuance of the Perſian or Grecian Impire; ſince neither the one nor the other is revealed in the Word. What is it to the purpoſe whether the Perſian Impire indured 100, 130, 200. years or more? It is ſufficient that we know ſo much thereanent, as may be gathered from Scripture, either in expreſſe termes, or by conſequent. What maketh it for the knowledge of the weeks, whether the Greek Impire indured 300. years, or longer, or ſhorter, ſo being that we hold right the maine Period?

Now in particular to the aſſumption: That all approven and grave Hiſtorians affirm that the Perſian Monarchy indured above 200. yeares, I anſwer by denying the ſame. I will therefore give 12. inſtances in the contrare, whereof ſome are taken from the Scripture it ſelf, and ſome from other Writers; Howbeit not Hiſtorians by profeſſion, yet all of them Hiſtorians, in ſo far as concerneth that ſubject.

In the mean time, the inſtances that I am to bring, do not all directly, and in expreſſe termes,

termes, affirme, that the Persian Empire, from *Cyrus* to *Darius*, continued a shorter space then 200. years. Only they prove the same indirectly, and by consequent, which is sufficient for improving the assumption. Neither am I to set down those instances conjunctly, but severally, and dispersed here and there among the reasons that are to bee brought against *Rainolds* assumptions, and that for eschewing of needlesse repetitions.

I will therefore subjoin ten Reasons for proving of the shortnesse of the Persian Monarchy, and consequently that the Grecian account, by the Olympiades, and the Chaldean account by the Ecclipses, are but false and erroneous, and therefore unfit for the right reckoning of *Daniels* weeks, howbeit, at this time, they be in too great request among men of most singular learning.

My first Reason is this, if the 70. weeks be a definite number of years, to wit 490. beginning at the going out of the Lords Commandement, Dan. 9. 23. *&c.* and ending at CHRISTS Death, whereof 300. years given to the Grecian Empire, are uncontroverted: 60. or rather 63. given to

to the Roman Empire, are unqueſtioned, then there cannot remain to the Perſian Monarchy above 140. years, but rather the count muſt be ſhorter, to wit, 127.

But both the beginning and the end of thoſe 490. years is acknowledged by *Rainolds* himſelf: the two latter parts are uncontroverted: Therefore the firſt, to wit, the time of the continuance of the Perſian Empire, being not above 130. years, but within the ſame muſt hold uncontrolled, ſince the former Periode of 490. years is proven already, not to bee an uncertain, but a certain time.

2. The 490. years are ten Jubilies, beginning at the going out of the Commandement, and ending at the death of our Saviour: So if this count be holden, the Death of CHRIST ſhall directly fall in the ſolemnity of the laſt Jubilie, and the verity ſhall be anſwerable to the Type and Figure: But if the Perſian Empire be either protracted beyond the time foreſaid, or contracted within the ſame, The Death of CHRIST ſhall not fall in a Jubilie: Wee muſt rather then, conforme forraign Hiſtories to the Scripture, nor the Scripture

to

to forraign Histories. They who protract the Persian Empire beyond 200. years or to that length, can never be able to do this.

3. If the Persian Impire indured 200. years, then *Zerubbabel* was Governour over Judah 146. years. For from the first of *Cyrus*, in the which *Zerubbabels* government began, till the 20. of *Artaxerxes Memor.*, when *Nehemiah* was made governour, Neh. 1. 1. compared with c. 5. 14. they reckon so many years by the time of the reigne of the Kings of Persia, and the Olympiads. And *Scaliger* rightly collecteth from Neh. 12. 47. that *Zerubbabels* government continued till the time that *Nehemiah* was appointed to be ruler over Judah, in his 6. book of Emend. of times: Howbeit some others, but without any good warrant, insert *Rhesa Meshullam*, the son of *Zerubbabel*, betwixt these two.

But this long continuance of *Zerubbabels* government can not stand with the truth. For from the dayes of *Noah* till this time, it will not be found, either in sacred or prophane, ancient or recent History, that any one man did govern a people or nation above a few years beyond the half of that time.

Octavius Cæsar Augustus enjoyed the Roman Impire 56. years after the death of *Julius*, in the which are also included 12. years, wherein *Antonius* was his colleague: *Plutarch* giveth to *Artaxerxes Memor* 62. years, howbeit others give unto him 40. or 44. And yet he reigned not alone all those years, but conjunctly for a space with *Darius Nothus* his predecessor: as may be gathered both from Scripture, comparing Ezr. 6. 14. with c. 7. 1. and is testified also by *Plutarch*. *Masiniſſa* reigned 60. years, as *Plinius* affirmeth, lib. 7. 48.

Joseph ruled in Egypt from the 30. year of his age, till the time of his his death, 80. years: neither do I remember of any other whose government exceeded this time.

Severus Sulpitius, in his second book of sacred History cited by *Rainolds* himself, assigneth but 120. years, to *Zerubbabels* whole age: but *Rainolds* giveth unto his government above 130. and is of that minde, that he died soon after the finishing of the Temple: but this he affirmeth without warrant. It is manifest, saith he, that the LORD promised him some rare thing, Zech. 4. 9. in these words

words: *The hands of Zerubbabel hath laid the foundation of the house, his hands shall also finish it.* True indeed, but that is nothing to the purpose: for what warrant is there for any man to beleeve, that when the Temple had lyen desolate before by the space of 70. years, all the time of the captivitie, it should yet remain unbuilded for the space of 107. years further, in whole almost 180. Of all whom I have seen, who speak in particular anent *Zerubbabels* government, not one giveth half so much time to the same, as doth *Rainolds. Melanchton, Gualter*, and *Alstedius* give not thereto above 58. years. *Junius* writing upon the book of *Ezra*, in the which *Zerubbabels* government is contained in his first edition, giveth not unto the same above 49. years, a great deal nearer the truth, then when in his third edition, hee giveth unto the book of *Ezra*, and consequently unto *Zerubbabels* government 146. years.

The Genevah Translation in the marginall annotation Ezra 2. 2. giveth unto *Zerubbabel* the chief Captain till the time of *Nehemiah* 54. years.

Lavater

Lavater in his preface upon the book of *Ezra*, giveth unto that whole hiſtory 70. years.

James Pilkinton Maſter of S. Johns Colledge in Cambridge, in his Commentary upon *Haggai*, acknowledgeth the trueth of that which is ſpoken by the Jews, Joh. 2. 20. that the ſecond Temple was 46. years in building. To the ſame agreeth *Calvine* writting upon the place it ſelf.

All thoſe according to the Text of the Hiſtory of *Ezra*. and the former teſtimony of the Jews, witneſſe that neither *Zerubabels* government endured 112. years, nor yet that the Temple was ſo long in building and conſequently that the Perſian Empire muſt come ſhort by many years of thoſe that are commonly given unto it. Thoſe all controll the aſſumption of *Rainolds* Syllogiſme. In vain therefore doth he go about to perſwade us of *Zerubabels* long age, becauſe he was the Type of Chriſt, who is called the father of Eternity, as if all thoſe had been of great age who were Types of CHRIST.

4. The former computation of the years of

of the Persian Empire is controlled by *Josua's* time in the High-Priest-hood, which should have been also 112. years. that is almost the double of as much time, as the Scripture giveth to any one of the High-Priests, from *Aaron* downward. I know that the Hebrews whom some of our writters follow, give unto *Phinehas* the son of *Eleazar* 300. yeers, that is, all the time of the Judges: But they are confuted by the Text it self, 1 Chron. 4. 4. where there are six generations reckoned betwixt *Phinehas* and *Achitub*, who was High-Priest in *Sauls* time, and yet in that computation both *Eli* is omitted, and *Phinehas* his son, who was the father of *Achitub*, 1 Sam. 14. 3.

Rainolds telleth us of *Moses*, who lived 120. years, and *Aaron* who lived 133. and that *Josua* might live as long as they did. But to what purpose is this said? The question is not how long *Josua* might live, but how long he lived, or rather how long he ruled. *Moses* governed Israel but 40. years, the time they were in the wildernes. *Aaron* dying a space before him, enjoyed not the Priest-hood so long: Neither did any

of

of them exceed the ordinar age of man at that time. And if *Joſua* lived no longer, nor *Moſes* or *Aaron*, and was High-prieſt all the time from the firſt of *Cyrus*, till the ſixth of *Darius Nothus*, even 112. years, as they reckon, then he behoved to enter the Prieſthood, being a childe often or eleven years of age, contrare to the Law, whereby it was provided that they ſhould not enter before 30. years of age. So alſo *Rainold* telleth us of *Jehojada*, who lived 130. years. What then, he was not High-Prieſt, as appeareth the half of that time. *Alſtedius* Chronol. 13. giveth unto his Prieſthood 70. years, but without warrant from Scripture, which determineth not the time, but that commeth far ſhort of 112. years.

The place Haggai 2. maketh greatly againſt the lengthning of the Perſian Empire. The Prophet exhorting the people to the building of the Temple, which was begun in *Cyrus* time, ſpeaketh to them in this manner: Who is left among you, and who ſaw the houſe in her firſt glory? And how do yee ſee it now? It is not in Compariſon of it

as

as nothing? From those words, it may be with good warrant collected, that there were some then alive who had seen *Solomons* Temple: Now those behoved to have been about 200. years old, at the finishing of the second Temple, it being presupponed, that according to the minde of those who from the first of *Cyrus*, to the time of *Darius*, when the Temple was reedified, there passed 112. years, which was far beyond the age of any that lived, not only at that time, but also far beyond the age of those who lived a thousand year before the Persian Monarchy. For as Mr *Pemble* writting upon Zech. 1. sayeth truely, before the Captivity, we must conceive them to have been about 20. years old, to observe the first Temple. The Captivity endured 70. years: From the end thereof, as they reckon, to the 6. of *Darius Nothus* are 112. years, in some 200. years and above.

Unto this it is answered by *Scaliger*, and *Rainolds*, that the forme of speach is like that Mat. 12. 11. *What man is there among you, that shall have a sheep, and if it fall in a pit on the Sabbath Day, will he not lay hold*

on

on it and lift it out? This they ſay, is ſpoken by way of ſuppoſition, and is true howbeit not any of thoſe who were preſent, had a ſheep that was fallen into a pit. In like manner they will have the ſpeach, Hag. 2. 3. to be uttered only by way of ſuppoſition. And this ſort of ſpeach they affirme to be frequent among the Hebrews, as Jer. 9. *O that my head were a well of water*, &c. According to the Hebrew, *Who will give my head*, &c. This way they anſwer.

But the circumſtances of the Text maketh againſt them.

The words Mat. 12. 11. are ſpoken by way of a Parable, neither is it neceſſar, that a Parable be of a thing that is actually done, but of ſuch a thing as may be done. But the place Haggai 2. 13. is no Parable, but a ſimple ſpeach.

2. The words cited from Jer. 9. are ſpoken by way of wiſhing, at leaſt in ſenſe: But the Text of Haggai is not optative, but interrogative, as all the Tranſlations beare. Again the words are not *who is among you*, but *who is left among you?* Importing that there were ſome at leaſt, left among them, who

who had seen the former house in her glory. And thereafter how do ye see it now? Is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing? If this speach was directed to them who were present, and had not seen the former house in her glory: then it is impertinent, and the sense of it is a nonsense: For in what respect could it be said unto those who had never seen the glory of the former Temple: How do ye see it now? And then again, is it not in your eyes in comparison of it, as nothing? How could the latter be as nothing in comparison of the former, in the eyes of them who had never seen it?

Gualter writting upon Haggai 1. in his first Homile, affirmeth that it is manifest out of the second Chapter, that there were yet some alive, who had seen *Solomons* Temple: And he esteemeth it an absurde thing, and unwarrantable either by testimonie of Scripture or credible History, that the Temple should have lyen unbuilded the space of 150. years: Yea, according to *Scaliger* and *Rainolds* almost 180. years.

6. The same is confirmed by the age of *Ezra*, who Ezr. 7. 1. is called the son of

Seraiah, but *Seraiah* was killed by *Nebuchadnezzar*, at the beginning of the Captivity, 2 King. 25. 18. Now as *Ezra* behoved to be begotten before the death of his father, even so he was alive in *Nehemiahs* time, Nehem. 8. and if the Temple was 112. years in building, then certainly *Ezra* at that time was above 200. years old: For he lived at least, till near the end of *Nehemiah* government, which was in the 32. year of *Artaxerxes Memor*, according to their account, who give 19. years unto *Darius Nothus*, that is 45. years after the building of the Temple. In summa, according to their account, 227. years, a thing deserving no credit.

It is answered by *Rainolds*, that *Ezra* was not the immediate son of *Seraiah*, but mediat, and is called his son according to the Hebrew Phrase, whereby one is called the son of such a man, whereas he is but his Oye, or Pronevoy, or descended from him, after four or five generations, which are not named in the Text, Ezra 7. but omitted, as there are six generations in that same place, Ezr. 7. pretermitted betwixt

Meraioth

Meraioth and *Azariah*. which are recorded 1 Chron. 6.

This answer annulleth not the Argument. It is true, there are six generations omitted, Ezr. 7. for brevities cause betwixt *Meraioth* and *Azaria*. This is manifest by the Text of Scripture. But there is no appearance that there are any omitted between *Seraiah* and *Ezra*; That can neither be proven by expresse Scripture, nor by consequent. Upon the contrare, there is but one named betwixt *Seraia* and *Josua* (*Ezra's* Cousing and Coetanean) to wit *Jehozadak*, 1 Chron. 6. 15. Ezra 3. 2. How then should there be diverse generations interveening betwixt *Seraiah* and *Ezra*: whereof the Scripture must be silent? The reason therefore taken from *Ezra's* age must stand sure.

7. To the same purpose maketh the age of *Nehemiah*, who was one of those who with *Zerubbabel* returned from the Captivity, Ezra 2. 2. and lived even to the end of the Persian Empire. For in the twelfth chapter of his History v. 22. he maketh mention of *Darius* the last King of Persia.

Rainolds answereth that there were two

Nehemiahs but the Text giveth no warrant for any such thing, and it might be said with as good reason, there were two *Zerubabels*, two *Ezras*, and two *Josuahs*.

8. For making up of the former imagined 200. years, they give 36. unto the reigne of *Darius Histaspis*, the third King of Persia. But *Clesias* the Greek Historian affirmeth, that he lived onley 36. years, of this see further before in the fifth Periode, where it is showen that it is most like, that he did not reign the third of 36. years.

9. They labour to hold out the former account, by giving unto *Darius Nothus* 19. years, and yet the Scripture maketh no mention of him after the finishing of the Temple, which was in his sixth year, Ezra 6. 15. Immediatly thereafter, is subjoined the History of *Ezra's* sending to Jerusalem from Babylon, in the seventh year of *Artaxerxes Memor*, Ezra 7. 8. which was the next year after the building of the Temple: But they will have this to be the seventh year of *Artaxerxes*, after the expiring of the 19 year of *Darius*, which crosseth the Text

Text of Ezra: For in it, *Artaxerxes* reign beginneth not 19. years after the reign of *Darius*, but conjunctly with him, which Plutarch also testifieth. Otherwise, how could it be said Ezra 6. 14. that the Jews builded and prospered, according to the commandement of *Cyrus*, and *Darius*, and *Artaxerxes* King of Persia, which commandement was given out in the second year of *Darius* Ezra 4. 24. Heer then, according to the Scripture it self, there must be 19. years rebated: For *Darius* his six years were conjunct with the reign of *Artaxerxes*. This want justly maketh all the rest of the 200. years to be more suspected.

10. To this purpose fitly agreeth that which Joh. 2. 20. is said by the Jews, *Fourty and six years was this Temple in building*, &c. Now if the Temple was but 46. years in building, it was not 112. years in building: But against this saying of the Jews many things are objected.

Bullinger thinketh, that they might overreach in this speach as they do Joh. 8. 57. in those words: *Thou art not 50 years old, &c.* But then the Temple should have been so

far from 112. years in building, that it ſhould not be 46. years: yea the whole firſt ſix Kings of Perſia ſhould not reigne 46. years.

Oecolampadius altogether rejecteth this ſaying, as he alleadgeth, it was ſpoken through envy, but what envy? Howbeit the Jews envyed CHRIST, they had no envy againſt the Temple, of the which this ſpeach is uttered, but they rather idolized the ſame. Again how many truths are uttered through envy? As by *Doeg* 1 Sam. 22. by the Ziphims, 1 Sam. 13. 19. by *Daniels* adverſaries, Dan. 6.

Likewiſe *Joſeph Scaliger* in his ſixth book rejecteth this teſtimony upon this reaſon. becauſe thoſe ſeven weeks were appointed for building of the City, and ſtreet, and not of the Temple. This is affirmed by *Scaliger* without any ſufficient ground. For Iſa. 44. 28. forteold that *Cyrus* ſhould give warrant not only for building of the City, but alſo of the Temple: and ſo it came to paſſe, that the Temple began to be builded in *Cyrus* his own time, and was finiſhed in the reign of *Darius* Ezr. 4. 10. and 6. 15.

but

but the building of the City took up a larger time: For howbeit it was begun in the time of the building of the Temple, Ezr. 4 12. and the Prophet Haggai 1. 4. objecteth unto the Jews that they dwelt in sieled houses, whileas the Temple was not as yet finished, but lay waste. We finde notwithstanding that when the wall was built, the City was not altogether repaired, but was in part unbuilded, Nehem. 7. 1. and v. 4. The seven weeks were therefore alloted to the building and perfiteing of the Temple, in the which space the City began in part to be reedified, and was accomplished within the compasse of the 62. weeks. The particular time of the finishing of the Temple is expresly set down, but not the particular time of the finishing of the building of the City.

H. Brughton. and *A. Willet* begin those 46. years at the third of *Cyrus*, when the work was hindered, and end at the sixth of *Darius*. But the work first was hindered not in the third, but in the second year of *Cyrus*, in the which it was begun. For this cause it was, that *Daniel* was in heavi-

nesse

neſſe three weeks of dayes in the third year of *Cyrus*, in the firſt moneth thereof, Dan. 10. 1, 2, 3, 4.

The truth then is this, if we reckon exactly, the Temple was not 46. but 48. years in building: for it was begun in the ſecond year, and ſecond moneth after the peoples return, Ezra 3. 8. and was finiſhed in the ſixth of *Darius*, upon the third day of the moneth *Adar*, which is the laſt moneth, Ezra 6. 15. It may ſeem then, that the Jews in their count, have miſſed two years. But we muſt conſider that this reckoning of the Jews, is by excluding both the termes, that is both the firſt and the laſt years, by reaſon that both thoſe were ſomewhat broken, each one of them lacking a moneth. This holdeth according to the ſeventh Chronologicall inſtruction, ſet down in the beginning, and is the true reckoning not hitherto perceived.

To conclude it may be gathered manifeſtly of the premiſſes, that the firſt part of the Perſian Monarchy, did not endure above 49. years, that is the ſpace of a jubilie from the firſt of *Cyrus* which was the year preceeding

ceeding the building of the Temple, unto the sixth and last of *Darius*, in the which it was finished.

Question seventh.

That the 70. weeks are determined at the Passion of Christ, and neither before the same, nor after the destruction of the City.

HOwbeit it be the minde of some, that the 70. weeks are determined at the Baptisme of CHRIST, this cannot hold, because Dan. 9. the death of the Messiah is coupled with the end of those weeks.

But the ending of them at the destruction of the City, may seem to have some greater appearance: I will therefore set down the reasons that are brought for that opinion, with answers unto the same.

1. The Angel saith, 70. weeks are determined over the People, and over the Holy City, that is, within which time there shall be a destruction of both.

2. Our Blessed SAVIOUR applyeth this Prophecy of *Daniel* unto the desolation and destruction of Jerusalem, Mat. 24. 15.

3. *Daniel*

3. *Daniel* firſt maketh mention of the deſtruction of the City and Sanctuary, and then ſpeaketh of the confirming of the Covenant in one week, and of the ceaſing of the ſacrifices in the midſt of the week, which if it be underſtood of CHRIRTS Death, it were a prepoſterous order, that after the deſtruction of the City, which happened 40. years after, he ſhould return to ſpeak of the MESSIAH His Death.

4. To what purpoſe ſhould mention bee made here of the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, if it be not within the compaſſe of thoſe weeks?

Anſw. 1. The Angel expoundeth himſelf hereafter, how theſe words are to be underſtood. (Upon thy people) that is, to finiſh their ſin, and to ſeal up their iniquities, by the anointing of MESSIAH. This was the ſpeciall intendment and ſcope of thoſe weeks; yet ſo as if they rejected his gratious offer, then deſtruction ſhould follow and come upon them.

2. Our Bleſſed SAVIOUR ſpeaketh not Mat. 24. of *Daniels* propheticall weeks, but only of the abomination of deſolation ſpoken of by the Prophet *Daniel*. Neither doth

doth it follow, because it is here spoken of, that therefore necessarly it should be comprehended within the compasse of the 70. weeks.

3. There is no disorder at all in the Prophecy: for *Daniel*, having propounded briefly and jointly together the slaying of the MESSIAH, and destruction of the Citie, v. 24. afterward cometh to handle them severally, and more fully in the verse following. Having spoken of the 7. weeks and 62. jointly, afterward he returneth to the 7. weeks, after the which the street and wall should be built in the 62. weeks. Then v. 26. he showeth what was to be done after the 62. weeks, to wit, the slaying of the MESSIAH in the last week: and that the destruction of the City should follow thereafter; both which are expressed partly in the 26. verse, but more clearly in the 27.

4. The destruction of Jerusalem is mentioned, howbeit it fall not within the compasse of the 70. weeks: because it followed as a punishment for the death of CHRIST. It is therefore put immediatly thereafter: as *Lyranus* hath conveniently observed.

Now

Now for the determining of the weeks, at the death of our Saviour, diverſe reaſons are given.

1. The laſt week endeth at the confirmation of the Covenant or Teſtament, as the Prophecy ſaith; he ſhall confirm the Covenant with many in one week. The week then muſt end with that confirmation. For not the beginning, but the end, (it being *potior pars*, the better part, by reaſon of CHRISTS Death in it) is counted for the week, and by our Saviours death the Teſtament was ratified, Heb. 9. 17. The Teſtament is confirmed when men bee dead. Therfore the laſt week endeth in CHRISTS Death.

2. The 70. weeks end with the laſt Jubilie, the laſt Jubilie endeth with the Death of CHRIST; therefore the 70. weeks end with CHRISTS death. See more anent this before in the fourth Periode, in the Treatiſe of the Jubilies. Adde this further, that when CHRIST offered himſelf upon the Croſſe, all the Legall Rites ceaſed: and from that time, (as ſaith *Oecolampadius*) the ſacrifices were rather *laniena*, butcheries then

then true sacrifices. Therefore *Scaliger*, *Junius*, *Polanus*, and *Alstedius*, who begin the account of the weeks and Jubilies at the second year of *Darius Nothus*, reckoning from thence 490. years, to the overthrow of Jerusalem, where they will have them to end, can never make CHRISTS Death to fall in a Jubilie year.

3. The finishing of iniquity, and the taking away of sin were accomplished in the Passion of CHRIST.

But 70. weeks are determined for the finishing of iniquity: therefore the 70. weeks are determined at the passion of CHRIST; For the taking away of iniquity and the finishing of transgressions, which are propounded by the Angel in his first speech, are the proper effects of CHRISTS Passion.

Moe reasons to this effect are set down by others: But let those suffice for the present.

Adde unto the former Reasons, the consent of *Julius Africanus*, *Beda*, *Rupertus*, *Oecolampadius*, *Burgensis*, *Bullinger*, *Melanchton*, *Bibliander*, *Beroaldus*, *Hugh Brughton*, *Pintus*, *Arrias Montanus*, *Rainolds*, *Cappellus*, *Gualter*, *Perkinse*, *Pareus*, *Rollock*, *Pemble*,

Pemble, *Willet*, and many others all determining the 70. weeks at the Passion of CHRIST.

Question seventh.

When the seven weeks that is the 49. years began, and when they ended.

HOwbeit by the things that hath been already delivered, no small light might be given to this Question, yet because it requireth a more ample discourse for further clearing of the same. I will insist somewhat further therein.

There is no Text of Scripture more pestered with manifold errours then this of the 70. weeks, which is made like the augæanstable, whereof this of the first seven weeks hath a large skare, howbeit I have perused sundry, who have handled this subject, yet I professe, that I could not obtain full satisfaction of any one of them. no not of them all: But I have drawen out of their writs, what I conceive to be most agreeable to the truth, adding my self thereto, what I thought most convenient. Many of their errours I have not meddled with, findng that the same would

would be both tedious to my self and unprofitable to the Reader: Only I have hit upon some that are most eminent, by reason of the singular account of the Authors.

It appeareth to me to be a thing most certain that the seven weeks being the first part of the 70. hath one and the same beginning with them: to wit from the going out of the Word and Commission given by God to the Angel *Gabriel*, to bee revealed to the Prophet *Daniel*, as is evident to any who readeth the 25. verse, as also by the reasons given in before sec. 5. anent the beginning of the 70. weeks whereof the seven are the first part, unto the which the Reader may return. Neither will I use any further probation to that effect.

The causes of errour in this first part of weeks, and consequently of the erroneous counting of the time of the Persian Empire, as also of straying in the next part, are especially three. 1. The confounding of the names of the Persian Kings. 2. The misapplying of names, actions, and deeds, attributing them impertinently unto those, unto whom they do not appertain. 3. The protracting

protracting of the Perſian Empire, and the reign of their Kings, beyond the juſt meaſure of time.

To ſpeak then of the firſt, it is a foul blot in *Jacobus Cappellus*, ſo learned a Humaniſt, that he confoundeth the whole names of the Kings of Perſia' contrarie both to the Greek Hiſtories, and the Scripture it ſelf. For at the year of the world 3479. He ſaith on this manner, that as *Cæſar* was called either *Julius Cæſar*, or *Caius Julius Cæſar*, even ſo the Kings of Perſia were called eiby one or by three names. And therefore at the year of the world, 3471. he maketh the *Aſſuerus* named Ezr. 4. 6. to be *Tanyoxares*, who otherwiſe was called *Smerdes* the Magitian: For (ſaith he) the names have great affinitie, and agree, and the *Artaxerxes* following v. 7. is *Cambyſes*.

But either I am far deceived, or then *Cappellus* hath heer greatly failed, whereas hee alleadgeth that the Kings of Perſia had either one, or three names as *Cæſar* had: Either he meaneth of ſome of the Kings of Perſia, or all of them. But I do think that ſcarcely either the one or the othet holdeth.

Who

Who did ever read that in any historian, especially in the Greeks, who are most to be credited, that *Cyrus*, or *Cambyses*, or *Xerxes* were either called *Darius* or *Artaxerxes?* For those are the names that he giveth to them. Who did ever read that any of the three *Darius*, to wit, *Hystaspis*, *Nothus*, or *Darius Codomanus* was called *Artaxerxes?* What ancient approved Author or Historian can he produce for justifying of his affirmation? If this should hold, then the Kings of Persia could not be distinguished one from another, and that which is written of them in the Histories of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, should be as doubtfull as the Oracles of *Apollo*, as indeed they, who maintain so great confusions, have made them. How much better saith *Alstedius*, in his second observation, after his 17. Chronologie, that the Kings of Persia were almost called either *Darius* or *Artaxerxes*, not both?

In that speech of *Cappellus*, that I cited, there are as many errors as words. First: whereas he calleth *Smerdes Magus*, *Tanyoxares*. He telleth us in his own History, as doth diverse others also, that *Tanyoxares*

protracting of the Persian Empire, and the reign of their Kings, beyond the just measure of time.

To speak then of the first, it is a foul blot in *Jacobus Cappellus*, so learned a Humanist, that he confoundeth the whole names of the Kings of Persia' contrarie both to the Greek Histories, and the Scripture it self. For at the year of the world 3479. He saith on this manner, that as *Cæsar* was called either *Julius Cæsar*, or *Caius Julius Cæsar*, even so the Kings of Persia were called eiby one or by three names. And therefore at the year of the world, 3471. he maketh the *Assuerus* named Ezr. 4. 6. to be *Tanyoxares*, who otherwise was called *Smerdes* the Magitian: For (saith he) the names have great affinitie, and agree, and the *Artaxerxes* following v. 7. is *Cambyses*.

But either I am far deceived, or then *Cappellus* hath heer greatly failed, whereas hee alleadgeth that the Kings of Persia had either one, or three names as *Cæsar* had: Either he meaneth of some of the Kings of Persia, or all of them. But I do think that scarcely either the one or the othet holdeth.

Who

Who did ever read that in any historian, especially in the Greeks, who are most to be credited, that *Cyrus*, or *Cambyses*, or *Xerxes* were either called *Darius* or *Artaxerxes*? For those are the names that he giveth to them. Who did ever read that any of the three *Darius*, to wit, *Hystaspis*, *Nothus*, or *Darius Codomanus* was called *Artaxerxes*? What ancient approved Author or Historian can he produce for justifying of his affirmation? If this should hold, then the Kings of Persia could not be distinguished one from another, and that which is written of them in the Histories of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, should be as doubtfull as the Oracles of *Apollo*, as indeed they, who maintain so great confusions, have made them. How much better saith *Alstedius*, in his second observation, after his 17. Chronologie, that the Kings of Persia were almost called either *Darius* or *Artaxerxes*, not both?

In that speech of *Cappellus*, that I cited, there are as many errors as words. First: whereas he calleth *Smerdes Magus*, *Tanyoxares*. He telleth us in his own History, as doth diverse others also, that *Tanyoxares*

was the brother of *Cambyſes*, whom he, by a falſe accuſation, cauſed to be put to death, and therefore he being, in portraict and viſage, like to *Tanyoxares*, was taken for him, and after the death of *Cambyſes*, promoted to the Impire, which he enjoyed only ſeven moneths, after the which time, being diſcerned to be a deceiver, he was put to death, by the Princes of Perſia, as before hath been related.

If this ſuppoſed *Tanyoxares* was *Ahaſuerus* mentioned Ezra 4. how is it that *Cappellus*, contrary to the order of his own Hiſtory, and all others who writ of *Cambyſes*, ſetteth him next unto *Cyrus* before *Cambyſes*?

But I muſt proceed further to ſhow how he miſapplyeth both names and actions of the Kings of Perſia, whereby greater light will come to theſe 70. weeks.

Firſt. He excludeth the building of the Temple out of the compaſſe of the 70. weeks. 2. He will have *Darius Hyſtaſpis* to be the builder of the Temple. 3. He giveth only 25. years to the building thereof. 4. He beginneth the 70. weeks in the time of *Artax. Longimanus*, &c. I muſt therefore ſhow how

how he faileth in all thoſe. He ſetteth down his minde poſitively in all thoſe, almoſt giving no reaſon, as if his bare word were a ſufficient warrant. Againſt the firſt then I reaſon in this manner.

Whatſoever thing was foretold by any of the former Prophets to be performed by *Cyrus*, or contained within *Cyrus* his proclamation, or commanded by *Darius* thereafter, or found to be accompliſhed in the book of *Ezra*, cometh within the bounds of the 70. weeks. But ſuch is the building of the Temple foretold by *Iſaiah* chap. 44. to be performed by *Cyrus*, and was alſo contained within his Edict, 2 Chron. 36. 23. Ezra 1. 2. and was commanded thereafter by *Darius*, Ezra c. 1. and 6. *Ergò*.

2. *Cappellus* acknowledgeth that the building of the City cometh within the compaſſe of the 70. weeks: Therefore alſo the building of the Temple is contained within the ſame, unleſſe he will deny that the Temple was a part of the City, which was indeed the principall part thereof, and was chiefly intended both in *Iſaiahs* Prophecy, and *Cyrus* his proclamation, and was perfor-

med according to *Darius* his command; howbeit there be no mention thereof in *Daniels* Prophecy.

3. Whatsoever thing we find to have been performed in the books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, betwixt the going out of the LORDS Commandement unto the Angel *Gabriel*, Dan. 9. and the Death of CHRIST, cometh within the circuit of the 70. weeks.

But such is the building of the Temple. *Ergò*. The proposition must hold: because at the LORDS Commandement the 70. weeks begin, as is already proven. The assumption needeth no proof.

It followeth next, that I make it good that *Darius Histaspis* was not the builder of the Temple; And to this effect, I must borrow my first reason from greatly renouned *Scaliger*. The *Darius*, saith he, who was the builder of the Temple, had one *Artaxerxes* immediatly preceeding him, and another immediatly following him. See Ezra c. 5. and 6.

But I assume *Dar. Histaspis* had neither an *Artaxerxes* immediatly preceeding him, nor any of that name immediatly following. For

For *Cambyſes* was his immediat predeceſſor, and *Xerxes* his immediat ſucceſſor, and neither the one nor the other of thoſe is called *Darius* by any of the Greek Hiſtorians, whom we muſt chiefly beleeve in that errand. *Cappellus* alleadgeth not any of thoſe, but *Joſephus*, ſtiling *Cambyſes*, *Artaxerxes*. But *Joſephus* is the leſſe to be regarded, becauſe the Jewiſh Writers are known to erre, both in naming, and numbering of the Perſian Kings. Then who, I pray, is the *Artaxerxes* next following him? Surely *Xerxes*, who never by any other is ſo called, but by himſelf; he might, ſaith he, be called *Artaxerxes*. But the queſtion is not what he might be, but what he was called by any approven Hiſtorian.

2. The *Darius*, who was the builder of the Temple, had another *Darius* interveening betwixt him and *Cyrus*, as is to be ſeen in the Text of Ezra c. 5. But *Darius Hyſtaſpis* was the firſt Perſian King of that name, after *Cyrus*, and had no other *Darius* before him.

3. The *Artaxerxes*, who ſucceeded the builder of the Temple, reigned at leaſt 32. years, as the Scripture it ſelf teſtifieth, Neh.

13.6. *Xerxes*, whom *Cappellus* alleadgeth to have been the former *Darius* his ſucceſſor, reigned not above 22. years, as all Hiſtorians, and *Cappellus* in his own Hiſtory teſtifieth. Only Clement *Alexandrinus* giveth unto him 26. Wherefore neither could the builder of the Temple be *Darius Hyſtaſpis*, nor *Xerxes* his next ſucceſſor.

The former Arguments, whereby I have negatively proven *Darius Hyſtaſpis* not to have been the builder of the Temple, being affirmatively applyed to *Darius Nothus*, proveth him to have been the builder. Neither is it needfull that I uſe any other reaſon. Like as alſo hereby it is manifeſt, that the building of the Temple took up a longer ſpace then 25. years. Neither is it neceſſary, that I uſe any further probation to that effect.

But *Willet* is further out of purpoſe, who in his 58. queſt. affirmeth that the *Darius*, who was the builder of the Temple, and *Artaſhat* were both one, following herein, *Vatablus* and *Hugh Brughton*. But they are manifeſtly diſtinguiſhed in the Text, Ezra 6.4. where it is ſaid that they builded according to the commandement of *Cyrus*, and *Darius*,

Darius and *Artaxerxes* King of Persia; They are distinguished by the particle (*And*) This *Darius* (saith he) was *Artaxerxes Longimanus*.

This is a marvelous confusion, in the which three Kings are confounded, and that which is proper to *Darius Nothus* and *Artaxerxes Memor*, attributed to *Longimanus*, who was a speciall hinderer of the building, Ezra. 4: But *Willet* affirmeth him to be *Cambyses*.

It is true indeed, that *Cambyses* was a speciall hinderer of the work. But it is false that it was he who is meaned Ezra 4. 7. For betwixt him and *Longimanus* interveened both *Darius Hystaspis* and *Xerxes*, neither of whom in any ancient History is stiled *Artaxerxes*, like as *Darius Nothus* is never so named.

But we go further. It must be considered, where *Cappellus* beginneth the 70. weeks, he beginneth them at the seventh year of *Longimanus*, Ezra 7. who gave warrant to *Ezra* to return to Jerusalem, for setting in order of the Ecclesiastick Estate. But how could this be *Longimanus*, whom before he called *Xerxes*, the successor of *Darius Hystaspis*? And yet he was neither the one nor the

the other, but *Artaxerxes Memor* the ſucceſſor of *Darius Nothus*, as already hath been proven, and is acknowledged by *Scaliger*, *Funius*, *Polanus* and *Alſtedius*; So one errour followeth upon another.

The things that are attributed unto that *Artaxerxes* by *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, moſt fitly agree unto *Artax. Memor.* For *Zenophon* greatly commendeth him, affirming that he was juſt in his goverment, faithfull in keeping of his covenant, modeſt in his carriage, very magnificent towards other Princes and Common-Wealths, valiant in battell, courteous and kind unto his friends.

Cappellus objecteth, that the former *Artaxerxes* could not be *Memor* by reaſon that in his twentie year, when *Nehemiah* came to Jeruſalem, *Zenophon* teſtifieth that he was buſied in war, and could not be reſiding at his palace, Nehem. 2. 1. But might not *Zenophon* miſſe in counting of a years Might not the King have mannaged his Warre by a Vicegerent? or if he went out in perſon, might he not have given the warrant to *Nehemiah* before his going forth, which was in the firſt moneth, when Kings go out to battell

tell, as appeareth by the Scripture it self, 2 Sam. 11. 1. And the same is testified by *Borrhajus* upon that Text to have been the practise of Kings in those Eastern parts. *Cappellus* beginneth also the first 7. weeks at that same time, Ezra 7. and endeth them with *Nehemia's* government. But that continued only to the 32. year of *Artaxerxes*, as *Nehemiah* himself testifieth, c. 5. 14. to wit, from the 20. year of *Artaxerxes* to the 32. which from *Artaxerxes* his seventh year, where in *Ezra* returned to Jerusalem, maketh out only 26. years, so far short commeth this account of 49. years.

In this time, saith *Cappellus*, was the city and walls built, and the street: still on he strayeth. It is true indeed, that the City was built in the first seven weeks: but those had the same beginning with the 70. weeks, as before hath been proven, both according to *Isaia's* Prophecy, and *Cyrus* and *Artaxerxes* commandement for building the Temple. For the building thereof implyed also the building of the City, *& contrà*. For who can imagine that *Cyrus* and *Darius* gave commandement for building of the Temple, and

counter-

countermanded the building of the City, or gave no warrant for the same? Therefore the Prophet Haggai c. 1. 4. complained that the people themselves dwelt in seiled houses, while as the LORDS house lay wast.

Cappellus answereth to this, that in the time of the building of the Temple, it was but a village: but thereafter, in *Nehemia's* time, it was made a Citie.

This construction hath no warrant from the Word: and therefore is not to be admitted, We read of the building of the walls in *Nehemia's* time, and Dan. c. 9. 25. subjoineth the building of the wall and street in a troublesome time, immediatly not to the seven, but to the threescore two weeks. So the Temple and City were built in the first seven weeks, and the wall and street in the threescore two following.

Now whereas *Nehemiah* c. 2. 4. regrateth unto *Artaxerxes* that the City and sepulchre of his fathers did ly wast; This was not because there was litle or no building in it, but because the walls and street were unbuilt, and the City not sufficiently peopled. For this cause it is, that c. 11. 1. the tenth man is chosen

choſen out of other cities to dwell at Jeruſalem. There is no mention at all in *Nehemias* time, of the building of the City.

The third cauſe of erring both in this Period, and the next, is, the protracting of the Perſian Impire beyond the juſt time, of the which I have ſpoken ſufficiently before in the firſt Section.

It is ſtrange to me, that ſuch a multitude of learned men ſhould diſſever and disjoine the laſt Period of 70. weeks from the former of 70. years, ſome of them by the ſpace of fourſcore, and ſome others by the ſpace of 100. years and above, contrary to their own practiſe, knitting the former Periods together, as links of a chain: and contrary to the practiſe of the Scripture it ſelf. For Dan. 9. 2. after that the Prophet had mentioned the accompliſhment of the 70. years deſolation of Jeruſalem, his prayer being ended, immediatly he ſubjoineth the Prophecy of the 70. weeks by the Angel, v. 23, 24, *&c.*

Scaliger, *Junius*, *Polanus* and *Alſtedius* giving more then 200. years to the Perſian Impire, and counting 112. years from the firſt of *Cyrus* to the ſixth of *Darius Nothus*, when

when the building was finiſhed, begin the firſt 7. weeks, which are the firſt Period, at the ſecond year of *Darius Nothus*, and end them in the 32. of *Artax. Memor*, failing both in the beginning and the end. For the 70. weeks and the firſt ſeven weeks have both the ſame beginning, as already is declared. 2. They begin thoſe weeks near the time when they ſhould end, to wit, at the finiſhing of the work in the ſecond year of *Darius*. 3. Betwixt the ſecond year of *Darius Nothus*, and the 32. of *Artax. Memor*, there are not 49. years, but 31. See this proven before Queſt. 5. at the ninth reaſon.

I can perceive no ground of their diſſevering of the 70. weeks, by ſo great a ſpace from the 70. years, nor of protracting of the Perſian Impire unto ſo great a length, but that they would make *Sarah* the miſtreſſe, to ſerve *Hagar* the maid. They would draw the Scripture to agreement with the Greek Olympiads, and the uncertain years of the the Perſian Kings, which can no more accord, nor the yron and clay of *Nebuchadnezars* image, Dan. 2.

Before I end this purpoſe, I will endeavour to

to remove a doubt, which hath marred the wits of many of the Learned. It is thought not to be very apparent, that betwixt the first of *Cyrus*, and the sixth of *Dar. Nothus*, there should interceed only 49. years, this being the time of the reigne of five Kings of Persia, to wit, *Cyrus*, *Cambyses*, *Dar. Hystaspis*, *Xerxes*, and *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, together with the six years of *Dar. Nothus*, no wayes agreeing with the length of time that Histories give unto the reigne of those Kings.

Unto this I answer three things. 1. We may not measure the truth of Scripture by the Lesbian rule of humane Writs, but by the Lydian Stone of the Word it self, and we must rather suspect the want to be in the Histories of men, greatly known to disagree among themselves, then call the Truth of God in question. 2, It is a customable thing, that when the sons are come to age, their reigne is mingled with the time of their fathers government, which is manifest, not only by Scripture it self in the Kings of Judah and Israel, but also in the Kings of Persia, in particular, *Dar. Nothus*, and *Artaxerxes Memor*,

Memor, Ez. 4. 14. teſtified alſo by *Plutarch*, as before was mentioned, the like whereof might well befall unto ſome other Kings of Perſia. See anent this *Willet* on *Dan.* 9. queſ. 52.

3. I judge it no impoſſibility to make an agreement betwixt the Scripture anent this ſubject, and the Writs of others: I mean not all, but ſome of them. For how ſhould the Holy Writ agree with all thoſe, who ſo far diſagree among themſelves? Thus then it is. The Hebrews give unto *Cyrus* but 3. years, namely, in the Perſian Monarchy, and *Daniel* ch. 10. 1. mentioneth his third year, but no further is hard in Scripture of his time. *Joſephus* antiq. lib. 11. giveth unto *Cambyſes* 6. years, *Sulpitius* 9. whereof three muſt be underſtood to be mingled with his fathers reigne. *Junius* therefore both in his firſt and laſt edition giveth unto both but 9. years, *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *H. Brughton* give to *Dar. Hyſtaſpis* 8. years. See the ſame further confirmed in the fifth Period, in the confutation of the Chaldean reckoning by the Eccliſpſes. *Diodorus Sulpitius* and *Oroſius* give unto *Xerxes* 21. years, whereof there is great evidence that ſome of them

them were mingled with the years of his predeceſſor and ſucceſſor. *Thucidides*, *Plutarch* and diverſe other Authors teſtify that *Themiſtocles*, being baniſhed Greece, fled unto *Artaxerxes* the ſon of *Xerxes*, his father being yet alive, and they ſet the beginning of *Artaxerxes* reigne in the firſt year of the 79. Olympiad: But *Themiſtocles* died in the 1. year of the 77. Olympiade. So by this account *Artaxerxes* reigned in common with his father at the leaſt ſix years, *Pererius*, agreeing with moſt Hiſtorians, giveth unto *Artaxerxes Longimanus* 40. years. The long continuance of this Kings reigne may ſeem to mar our intention altogether. For removing of this difficulty, I do certainly judge, that there is an errour in the number, there being ſo great affinity betwixt the words, τεσσαρακοντα in the Greek, being put for τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατος, and *quadraginta* in the Latine for *quatuordecim*. The like whereof is found to be frequent in Chronologie: My reaſon is, becauſe ſome, as *Pererius*, *Oecolampadius* and *Melanchton* give unto *Artaxerxes Memor* 40. years: now a great many of our Writers have taken *Artaxerxes Longimanus* for the wrong man, as

I ſhew before, even for *Artaxerxes Memor*, who was the finiſher of the Temple conjunctly with *Darius*, Ezra 6. 14. But on the contrare, *Longimanus* was no ſmall hinderer of the ſame, Ezra. 4. 17. *&c.* and that this was *Longimanus*, it is moſt evident: for in the Hiſtory, he is directly placed in the midſt betwixt *Ahaſuerus*, who was no other but *Xerxes*, c. 4. 6. and *Darius Nothus* thereafter in the fifth and ſixth Chapters: And as they have erroneouſly attributed unto *Longimanus* the facts of *Artax. Memor*, even ſo they have aſcrived the years of his reigne unto him.

The juſt compt then of the 49. years muſt ſtand after this manner: *Cyrus* and *Cambyſes* did reign 9. years, ſome of the firſt whereof were mingled between them, as *Melanchton* alſo teſtifieth Chron. lib. 2. *Darius Hyſtaſpis* 8. years, *Xerxes* 21. whereof ſome of the firſt were mingled with the reigne of his preceeding father, as the ſame *Melanchton* witneſſeth, and ſome thereafter with the years of his ſucceſſor, as before hath been declared. If the firſt three of thoſe be given to *Dar. Hyſtaſpis* conjunct government before,

fore, and six unto *Longimanus* conjunct reigne thereafter, there will remain 12. to *Xerxes* his severall reigne, which the Scripture it self seemeth to approve. For Esth. 3. 7. the twelfth year of *Ahasuerus* is mentioned, and not any other thereafter. And in this year, all the rest of the History of *Esther* was accomplished between the first moneth thereof and the last, Est. 9. 1. *&c.* What followed ch. 11. in *Mordecai's* time, might be performed betwixt him and his son *Longimanus*. Adde this, that in so vast and large an Impire, it could not be, but the son especially, being come to maturity of years, behoved to be taken for a helper with his father. Subjoin unto *Xerxes* 12. years, 14. for *Longimanus*, and six for the conjunct reign of *Dar. Nothus* and *Artax. Memor*, in the last whereof, the work of the Temple was perfited, and ye have the full 49. years, which are the first seven weeks, and the 20. jubilie, the right disposing whereof maketh very much for the understanding of all that followeth, but hitherto hath been marvelously obscured by the diversitie of perplexed and confused opinions.

Queſtion eighth.

How the 62. weeks are to be underſtood.

OF the many opinions that are here, I will only ſingle out one or two, that the truth, being compared with them, may the better appear. *Scaliger* beginneth not the 62. weeks where the ſeven end, but giveth a diverſe beginning unto them: The ſeven weeks, as was ſaid, he beginneth at the ſecond of *Darius Nothus*, and endeth at the 32. of *Artaxerxes Memor*: The 62. weeks he beginneth in the firſt year of *Memor*, and endeth at the paſſion of CHRIST. Alſo he will have the laſt week, which followeth the 62. to be ſo divided, that the one half he ſetteth before the paſſion of CHRIST, and the other many years thereafter, at the deſtruction of the City. And thus they are ſtrangely diſmembered and diſjoined by a Man of ſo great learning.

This diviſion is no wayes anſwerable unto the Text of *Daniels* Prophecy. For firſt the great Period of 70. weeks is ſet down v. 24. and then the ſame is parcelled out, that every part orderly followeth upon the other for

for making out of the whole. The 7. weeks are first placed v. 25. and next after them the 62. with the things that should befall in both those Periods, and the last week next following the 69. v. 25. with the History, or rather Prophecy of the things that should befall therein. But *Scaliger* maketh all the years of the first seven weeks to fall within the compasse of the 62. three years only excepted, which were between the first of *Darius Nothus* and the fifth.

It was before shown how that the first 7. weeks could not end at the 31. or 32. of *Artaxerxes Memor*, as they could not take their beginning at the second of *Darius*. Then according to the order of *Daniels* Prophecy, the 62. weeks must not take within them any part of the 7. weeks, but must begin where the 7. weeks end. But the 7. weeks end at the sixth of *Darius* and his colleague, *Artaxerxes Memor*, as hath been demonstrat. Therefore the 62. weeks must begin then, that is, in the year following, when *Ezra* was sent to Jerusalem, Ezra 7. which was the seventh year of *Artaxerxes Memor*, but the first of his severall reigne after the reigne of *Darius*.

I know that our Learned Men, *Scaliger*, *Rainolds*, *Junius*, *Polanus*, and ſundry others will have the forenamed ſeventh year of *Artaxerxes*, not to be the next year following the building of the Temple, but the ſeventh year of his ſeverall reigne after *Dar. Nothus*, unto whom, with the moſt Hiſtorians, they give in whole 19. years: And thus there ſhall paſſe 19. years between the finiſhing of the Temple and *Ezra's* journey to *Jeruſalem*. but with their favour, this is but an imaginary conceit, which in part was diſproved before, Queſt. 5. at the 9. Reaſon: but here I will further diſprove the ſame. What were the certain years of the reigne of *Darius*, is no leſſe uncertain, then the time of the other Kings of Perſia: for howbeit moſt Hiſtorians give unto him 19. years, yet ſome give unto him fewer, and ſome above thrice 19. years: neither is it much to the purpoſe whether he did reigne 19. years or not. The Scripture never mentioneth him any more after the building of the Temple. And ſince both Sacred and prophane Hiſtory teſtifieth that *Artaxerxes*, from the beginning of his reigne, was aſſumed to be his colleague, we may

may justly think that either *Darius* his life and reigne ended with his sixth year, or then that *Artaxerxes* his former colleague was not exauhtorat, but still continued in managing the Jewish effairs. 2. If there was so long an intermission of time, why is *Ezra* not sent away before in the 4, 5, or 6. year of *Artaxerxes*, but his sending must be delayed till his seventh year, which in order is next unto the sixth, in the which the Temple was builded.

3. The order of the Text is against that conceit: For after the building of the Temple c. 6. immediatly is subjoined *Ezra's* journey c. 7. yea the building is perfited in the moneth Adar, which is the last moneth in the sixth year, c. 6. 15. and upon the first day of the first moneth of the seventh year *Ezra* took journey from Babylon, c. 7. 8, 9. (4.) If it were true which they alleadge, then there should be a blank in the History between the sixth and seventh Chapters of *Ezra* the space of 19. years, to wit, from the sixth of *Darius* till his supposed 19. and from thence to the 7. of *Artaxerxes*, the least appearance whereof is not in the Text

of *Ezra*, but altogether of the contrare. 5. What appearance hath it, that *Darius*, who c. 6. throughout, made ſo ſtrict a decree for building of the Temple, but eſpecially v. 11. and that ſacrifices ſhould be continually furniſhed, and what ever other things were needfull, v. 9. and that prayers ſhould be made for the King and his children, v. 10. ſhould have delayed the ſending of *Ezra*, all the dayes of his life thereafter, even 13. years, *Ezra* being ſent for that ſame end, c. 7. v. 14 till v. 27. and that his ſon *Artaxerxes* ſhould have delayed the ſame ſix years, after his fathers death? There is no probability hereof at all, eſpecially ſince the King commanded every thing to be done ſpeedily, c. 7. 17. and 21. It is moſt like that the new builded Temple ſhould have been evill provided, if *Ezra* his coming had been ſo long delayed.

Again, *Scaligers* opinion is eaſily improven by his own account: For he alloteth 200. years to the Perſian Impire, whereof he ſetteth 107. before the ſecond of *Darius*, when the Temple began to be re-edified, and 93. muſt neceſſarly follow thereafter to the end of

of the Empire: from the which, if three years be deduced betwixt the first and fifth of *Darius*, where *Scaliger* beginneth the 62. weeks, then there will remain 60. years, unto the which adde 300. years of the Greek Empire, and from thence 60. of the Roman Empire to the Passion, all agreeing to his own account, there arise in whole 450. years, which are 16. years beyond 434. the just number of the 62. weeks, *Polanus* agreeth with him anent the first seven weeks, beginning them at the second year of *Darius Nothus*, and ending at the 31. of *Artax. Memor*: But he differeth anent the 62. weeks For howbeit he end at the Passion, yet he beginneth not at the fifth of *Darius* with *Scaliger*, but at the 32. of *Artax. Memor.*

Neither can this account hold: For if, from the second of *Darius* to the 32. of *Artax. Memor*, be deduced 49. years of the Persian Monarchy, unto the latter part whereof, as they reckon, from the second of *Darius* to the end, they give 93. yeares, then there will remain only 44. years, which together with the years of the Greek and Romane Empire before mentioned, commeth

meth onely to 404. And ſo there will be 30. lacking to make out the juſt account of the 62. weeks, which is no leſſe then 434. years.

The truth is that the 62. weeks muſt begin at the 9. year of *Darius*, where the 7. weeks end, and hath their end at the laſt 70. weeks, to wit before the ſame, of the which we are to treat hereafter. Thoſe 62. weeks are rightly marched in this manner by *H. Brughton*, and *Willet*.

Queſtion ninth.

Of the juſt computation of the years. Of the Grecian Monarchy, and the beginning of the Kingdome of the Greeks, and certain numbers mentioned in the Prophecy of Daniel.

THere are diverſe wayes of the reckoning of the time of the Grecian Empire, but that which is by the Olimpiades, I eſteem to be ſureſt. For howbeit there is but ſmall certainty in that account, before the time of the Greek Monarchy, yet it proveth ſureſt thereafter in the Greek effairs.

Alexander began his reign, as is commonly

ly holden, after the overthrow of *Darius* at the third year of the 112. Olympiade, and died in the first year of the 114. as *Arrianus*, and most Chronologues do hold, and our Saviour suffered in the first year of the 203. Olympiade. So *Scaliger* reckoneth. The years interveening extend to 357. and with *Alexanders* six years to 363. From whence 63 must be abated from the end of *Cleopatras* reign, in whom the relicks of the Greek Empire were extinct) unto the Passion. So there will remain just 300. years for the Greek Monarchy, according to the Olympick account. Those 300. years *H. Brughton*, following *Clemens*, reckoneth by the reign of the Kings of Egypt. By this account there remain onely 127. years: not 130. as *H. B.* and *Willet* following *Beroaldus*, count, for the Persian Empire.

And this to be the surest reckoning may easily appear, by reason of the great harmony of diverse numbers all agreeing fitly together at the death of Christ, which was at the end of the 62. year of the Roman Empire, and the beginning of the 64. the 75.

Julian

Julian year ended, and the 76. beginning: The first year of the 203. Olympiade running. I say it was then running, because the Olympick years began upon the seventh of *July*, and CHRIST was crucified at the *Pasche*. So also the same came to passe in the solemnity of the last year of the 29. and last Jubilie.

Of the beginning of the Kingdome of the Greeks.

HOwbeit *Alexander* was the first King of the Greeks, and founder of the Empire, Dan. 8. 21. yet the beginning of the Kingdome of the Greeks is not counted from him by the Author of the Books of Maccabees, and *Josephus*, but from the reign of *Seleucus Nicanor*, who prevailed most among *Alexanders* successors: Because the Kingdom descended not to his posterity, as the Kingdom of the Seleucians did: For there were many descents in the same family. Untill the Kingdom was dissolved by the Romans, And howbeit it was not in any part of Greece but in Syria, and Chaldea, yet it is called the

the Kingdome of the Grecians, becauſe the Seleucians had their beginning from thence, and uſed the language, cuſtomes and ſuperſtitions of the Greeks.

There was alſo a deſcent and ſucceſſion of the *Ptolomeis* in the Kingdom of Egypt, whoſe race continued longer then the Seleucians in Syria, yet the other had the name of the Kingdom: becauſe they became mightieſt, and had chiefly to do with the people of God: And this account is called *Æra Seleucidarum*, or *Æra Contractuum*. *Æra* is an Arabick word, ſignifying a root or beginning of time, as doth alſo the Greek word *Epocha*.

Of the time, times, and an half, or a part of time mentioned Dan. c. 7. v. 25. and ch. 12. v. 7.

SOme think that hereby is meaned an unlimited time: But on the contrare, it is manifeſt, that a certain time is here deſigned and limited, and that by times years are ſignified, as c. 3. in the viſion of the great tree by ſeven times, are underſtood ſeven years.

The meaning then is, that the very time

is

is here preſcrived how long *Antiochus* ſhould be ſuffered to change the times and lawes, in polluting the Temple, and aboliſhing the ſacrifices, which was juſt three years and ten dayes. For this deſolation began in the 145. year of the *Seleucians* the 15. day of the moneth Ciſleu, Maccab. 1. 57. which in part anſwereth to our November, and continued to the 25. day of the ſaid moneth, in the 148 year of the reigne of the *Seleucians*, at the which time the Temple was purged, and the true worſhip re-eſtabliſhed by *Judas Maccabeus*.

How the 2300. *dayes mentioned* c. 8. 14. *are to be underſtood.*

BY thoſe 2300. dayes, not ſo many moneths or years, but ſo many naturall dayes muſt be underſtood, which make ſix years, 3. moneths and 20. dayes, counting 365. dayes to a year, as the Hebrews did.

There were c. 7. v. 25. mentioned a time, two times, and a part of time, that is, three years and ten dayes for the deſolation of the Sanctuary: But here the ſumme of 2300. dayes maketh ſix years, three moneths and

18. dayes, if two of those years be counted intercalary: the beginning whereof must be reckoned from the wicked defection of the people, procured by *Menelaus* the Priest, sent with letters from the King, on still to the repairing of Religion and Divine Worship. For that defection began in the 141. yeare of the Kingdome of the *Seleucians*, 1 Maccab. 1. 12. But *Antiochus* did not in that year accomplish the singular impiety that is related in that Chap. but in the next year, to wit, 142. in the sixth moneth, in the sixth day thereof, when *Menelaus*, who was also called *Onias*, did willingly offer that service unto *Antiochus Epiphanes*, as *Josephus* reporteth in the 12. book of his Antiquities, c. 6. from the which day, if ye reckon to the 25. day of the ninth moneth of the 148. year, there will be precisely 6. years, 3. moneths and 18. dayes. This compt therefore is to be inchoat from that defection, whereof *Menelaus* the high Priest was author This the demand of the Angel requireth, in the which it is questioned, not only anent the pollution of the Sanctuary, and inhibiting of the daily sacrifice, (as is in the 7. chap.

chap.) but also of the defection and falling away of the people. So *Polanus* following *Junius*.

Of the 1290. *dayes mentioned* c. 12. v. 11.

THat which he called before, a time, two times, and an half, is here explained to be 1290. dayes, that is, 3. years, 7. moneths, and about 13. dayes, which must begin from the prophanation of the Temple by *Antiochus*, which was in the 145. year, the 15. day of Cisleu, being the ninth moneth, 1 Maccab. 5. 57. and must end 40. dayes before *Antiochus* death, at such time as *Judas Maccabeus* had prosperous successe against the Ammonites with their captain *Timotheus*, after he had cleansed the Temple, and *Antiochus* himself was forced to suffer the Jewes to injoy their liberty and Religion, which was 45. dayes before the death of *Antiochus*, though the precise and particular time be not expressed in story. So *Polanus*.

Of the 1335. *mentioned* v. 12.

THe terme of 45. dayes added to the number of 1290. dayes, maketh 1335. dayes. Those

Those 45. days, added to the former summe, are set down to shew the death of *Antiochus*, which was in the 149. year, as is mentioned 1 Maccab. 6. 16. though the year, moneth and day of his death be not expressed in that History, yet it is without question, that it was 45. dayes after the Religion of the Jews was restored, and the State setled, according to the minde of *Junius* and *Polanus*.

Question tenth.

Certain memorable things that fell out within the bounds of this Periode.

1. WHile as *Alexander* the great was approaching toward Jerusalem, *Jaddua* the high Priest, who is named Neh. 12. came forth in his Pontificall apparell, being accompanied with his Levites and other Jews in a most humble manner, to supplicat for themselves. When *Alexander* saw the multitude approaching: whereas before he breathed out fire and destruction against them, incontinently he fell down upon his knees, in a most humble manner, before *Jaddua* the high Priest. When all, who beheld, were astonished, marveling what it could

could mean, that he, who had been adored by Princes, ſhould adore a guilty ſupplicant: he anſwered; I do not worſhip him, but the God whoſe Prieſt he is. For when I was intending my journey toward Aſia, a man like this appeared to me in my ſleep, who exhorted me to undertake the journey, and bade me hope for a good ſucceſſe. Then *Jaddua* alſo ſhew unto him the Prophecy of *Daniel*, who had foretold that the King of the Medes and Perſians ſhould be overcome by the King of Grecia. Thoſe things moved *Alexander* that he not only ſpared the Jewes, but alſo granted unto them to live according to their own Lawes, and he confirmed unto them whatſoever priviledges they had before injoyed under the Perſians.

2. At this time *Alexander* granted liberty to *Sanballat* to build a temple in mount Gerizim to the Samaritans, and baſtard and runnigat Jews, with whom thoſe of Jeruſalem had no fellowſhip.

3. *Ptolomeus Philadelphus* the third King of Egypt, after *Alexander* cauſed the whole Law, that is, the Old Teſtament to bee tranſlated in Greek by ſeventy Interpreters, every

every one of them taking a diverſe part, about 14. chapters, as the variety of the ſtile and skill declareth, of purpoſe in many places ſtraying from the Hebrew fountains, leaſt the Holy Verity ſhould trouble the mindes of the Greeks.

4. I can not omit that temerarious and ſacrilegious fact, which came to paſſe in the dayes of *Ptolemeus Philometor* the ſeventh King of Egypt.

Onias ſon to the high Prieſt, *Onias* the third, being diſappointed of the High-prieſthood by *Eupator*, did notably abuſe the place, Iſa. 19. 18, 19. eſpecially the word *Hæres* in the Originall, and deſired of *Ptol. Philometor*, that for his good ſervice done to him, he would grant unto him a place in the Territory of *Heliopolis*, that according to the former Prophecy of Iſaiah, he might build a temple there, in the which the Jews, that were in Egypt, might offer ſacrifices for the ſafety and welfare of the Kings of Egypt, which was granted unto him, together with revenews convenient for maintaining of the ſame. In that place *Onias* builded a temple, in many things, not unlike the Temple at

Jeruſalem, but more magnificent nor the ſame, which continued on ſtill untill the time of *Veſpaſian*, when the Temple of Jeruſalem was deſtroyed.

5. In the time of the Greek Empire, there aroſe three diverſe ſects among the Jews, to wit, the Phariſees, Sadduces, and Eſſenes: *Joſephus* firſt maketh mention of them Antiq. lib. c. 9. The time when thoſe firſt began, is not certain: For Chronologues much differ anent the ſame, but at leaſt, it was 100. years before CHRIST.

The Phariſees were ſuch as did forſake the common expoſition of the Law, given by the Scribes, and taught and framed a more exact and ſtrict expoſition thereof, according to the traditions of the Fathers. And they were moſt holy outwardly, and of chief account among the Jews.

And therefore the Apoſtle *Paul* ſaith, that, after the moſt ſtrict ſect of their Religion, he lived a Phariſee, Act. 26. 5. and that he was a Phariſee, the ſon of a Phariſee, Act. 23. v. 6.

The Sadduces were a ſect, that denyed Spirits, and Angels, and the Reſurrection, and

and immortality of the ſonl, Act. 23.8. They acknowledged only the books of *Moſes*.

The Eſſenes were like Popiſh Monks and Friers, which did ſeparate themſelves from the people, labouring with their hands, and vowing, and dedicating themſelves to live in perpetuall ſanctity.

Followeth certain other things to be conſidered concerning the life and death of our Saviour CHRIST Himſelf, which came to paſſe in the time of the Roman Impire.

Queſtion eleventh.

In what year of his age Chriſt was baptized?

BEda, *Chryſoſtome*, *Euthemius*, *Bernard*, and *Scaliger*, doe think, that CHRIST came to be baptized, after he was 30. years of age: but the word ὡσεὶ, Luk. 3.23. as it were 30. years old, ſheweth that he was not full 30. years.

To this *Scaliger* anſwereth, that the word ὡσεὶ ſometimes is not a word of doubting, but of affirming, as Joh. 1.14. *We ſaw his glory as the glory of the onely begotten Son*, &c. But this inſtance ſerveth not: He ſhould have given an inſtance where the word is uſed,

in numbering, otherwiſe then dubitatively, and in a popular manner of ſpeach.

The word ὡσεὶ importeth certainly, that CHRIST was now in the 30. year of his age: but the uncertainty is onely anent the particular time and ſeaſon thereof.

2. If our SAVIOUR was baptized in the 31. year of his age, and that year *Annas* was high prieſt, Luk 3. 2. then by reckoning of alternative courſes of the two high prieſts, *Annas* and *Cajaphas*, CHRISTS death falling in the 35. year of his age, as *Scaliger* maintaineth, ſhall not come to paſſe under *Caja*[illegible]as the text of Scripture beareth, Joh. 18. 12. but under *Annas*. Let this be well conſidered.

But leaving *Scaliger*, I muſt next enter the liſts with *Frederick Sphanhemius*, late Profeſſor of Divinity, in the Colledge of Geneva, a man of ſingular Learning, who in his ſecond book of Evangelick doubts, Doubt. 11. maintaineth, that it cannot be proven, that CHRIST was baptized in the 30. year of his age, but that it is uncertain, in what year he was baptized, in proving whereof, he ſeemeth to me to have laboured too too much. After

After this manner then he beginneth: The word ὡσει, saith he, is not affirmative and definite, but conjecturall and dubitative. *Scaliger* affirmed it to be taken affirmatively, But *Spanhemius* contrarieth him: because, as he alleadgeth, it is never taken otherwise in the New Testament, when it is used for designing of time, and reckoning of numbers, but ever doubtingly, and this he intendeth to prove, by induction of a number of places of Scripture, where the word ὡσει is used.

Unto the which I answer, that all the places that he citeth, are either impertinent, and by the purpose, or then, that they make against him. The places Acts 23. *And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire,* and c. 9. 18. *Immediatly there fell from his eyes as it had been scales,* are altogether impertinent; For in those, neither is there any time designed, nor numbers reckoned, as he propounded.

The third place he citeth. Heb. 11. 12. is no lesse impertinent, for there, no definite number is mentioned, as is Luk 3. 23. but onely an indefinite number.

He citeth Mat. 14. 21. Mark 6. 44. Luk 9. 14. John 6. 10. where it is said, *that those who did eat of the fishes and loaves were about five thousand men*, I answer, howbeit those places be little to the purpose, in respect that numbers of men are reckoned in them, and not years designing a space or intervall of time, as Luk 3. 23. yet those same places that he quoteth, are against him. For as in them all, the word ὡσεὶ noteth neither a thousand, more then fewer then 5000. but as appeareth, not compleet: So the same word Luk 3. 23. designeth not a year moe or fewer nor 30. but that our SAVIOUR was baptized in the 30. year of his age, begun, and yet not compleat? *Scapula* therefore translateth the word ὡσεὶ by *circiter*, or *ferme* about, or almost, and so doth *Calvin* in the same place Luk 3.

On the contrare, in reckoning of numbers, as it is taken affirmatively, and not doubtingly Mark 8. 9. *And those who had eaten were about* 4000. The same History is related, Mat. 15. And it is said affirmatively without addition, *that the number of those that had eaten were* 4000. So Luk 22. 41. *And he gat himself from them about a stones*

caſt. ὡσεὶ importeth not any more ſtones caſt but one, *Calvin* tranſlateth it *ferme.* The old tranſlation hath it affirmatively: But this is a great deal more clear, by thoſe places of Scripture, in which the word is uſed for deſigning of times, whether it be houres, dayes, moneths, or years, within or without thoſe mentioned in the ſentence where it is placed: But either it is taken not dubitatively, but affirmatively: or then it importeth that the houre, day, moneth, *&c.* is begun, but not perfected in the courſe thereof, which may be demonſtrate, not only by the places cited by *Spanhemius* himſelf, but alſo by many others. He citeth Luk 23. 44. *It was about the ſixth houre, and there was a darkneſſe over all the earth.* But what meaneth this? Doth the word ὡσεὶ import that it was either one or moe hours within or without the ſixth houre? No certainly. The Scripture beſt expoundeth it ſelf, Mar. 15. 33. where it is ſaid, that the ſixth hour was come, when the darkneſſe was over the land. So alſo Mat. 27. 46. it is ſaid, that *about the ninth hour Jeſus cryed with a loud voice*, &c. But Mark 15. 34. this is ſaid

to

to have been at the ninth houre, or rather in the ninth houre, according to the Originall. The like is, Act. c. 10. where the third and the thirty verſes muſt be compared together.

Spanhemius citeth Joh. 4. 6. It was about the ſixth houre, when JESUS, being wearied, ſat on *Jacobs* well. The meaning is, as is manifeſt by the former places, that the ſixth houre was come; For otherwiſe the ſpeech had been very impertinent. If it had been within the compaſſe of the fifth houre before, or the ſeventh houre thereafter, why ſhould the ſixth houre be named, rather then one of thoſe?

To this purpoſe I might cite diverſe other places, as in the Hiſtory of the Tranſfiguration, Luk. 9. 28. Luk. 1. 56. Luk. 2. 37. Act. 13. v. 20. the right reading being conſidered, whereof I ſpake before in the fourth Periode. So alſo Act. 13. 18. about the time of 40. years ſuffered he their manners in the wilderneſſe. The particle ὡσεὶ noteth not the defect or exceſſe of a year, but only the defect of three dayes. For upon the 14. day of the moneth Abib, the People came out of Egypt, Exod. 12. and 40. years thereafter,

after, upon the tenth day of the same moneth, they passed Jordan, and entred the Land of Canaan, Josh. 4. 19. In the same maner is the particle οὐ taken, Rom. 4. 19. neither, for ought I know, is the word ἀφ' οὗ otherwise used in any part of the N. Test. where times are designed: Howbeit in our vulgare language, the word, answering unto the same, importeth oftentimes no lesse an excesse, then a defect.

Spanhemius taketh his second answer from the translationes. The Syriak interpreter (saith he) translateth it dubitatively, *quasi filius annorum* 30.

The Syriak translation is no more dubitative, then the originall greek; which importeth no doubt at all anent the year, but anent the fullnesse only, and perfection of the year. This translation maketh also against *Spanhemius*: For *filius* 30 *annorum* is an Hebraisme, noting the current year.

The like whereof *Pareus* observeth in divers parts of Genesis, as c. 5. 32. c. 7. 6. and 11. The same was the age of *David*, when he began to reign, 2 Sam. 5. 4. And of *Joseph*. Gen. 41. 46. when he was promoted

moted to the Government by *Pharao*, who were both types of CHRIST, And of both is ſaid, according to the originall, that either of them was *filius 30 annorum*, which noteth the current year, as again ſaith *Pareus* on Gen. 41. 46. He addeth, that the Arabick interpreter altogether omitteth the particle ὡσει, and tranſlateth it, *Chriſtus incepit eſſe in triginta annis*: he might alſo have added the old latine interpreter, who tranſlateth it in the ſame manner. Both the one and the other make againſt him, For if our SAVIOUR, at the time of his baptiſme, began to be 30 years of age, then he was going in the ſame, according to our common phraſe of laugnage.

Next he referreth not the word ἀρχόμενος to the years of CHRIST, but to his office, and entering in the Miniſtrie, as doth *Origen* and *Beda* amongſt the Ancients, and *Janſenius* with others of the neoteriks. But what can this work more then thoſe things that have been ſaid before? For if the word ἀρχόμενος be referred to Chriſts office and Miniſtrie, then it hath ſpeciall relation to the 30 year of his age, which was the juſt time, at the which

which the Leviticall Priests were admitted unto the full administration of there function, Numb. 4.43. he subjoyneth, that the argument, taken from the Leviticall Priests, is lesse then topicall, and serveth not to prove a thing controverted, but to illustrate the thing that is before proven.

I answer, that the argument is so far from being lesse then topik, that it appeareth rather to be demonstrative.

For if our SAVIOUR came to fulfill all righteousnesse, Mat. 3.15. and for fulfilling of the Law, was circumcised on the eight day, And after the dayes of his mothers purification, was brought to the Temple, that offering might be made for him, Luk. 2.2. And commanded the leper, whom he healed, to shew himself to the Priest, and offer for his cleansing, according to the Law of *Moses*, Luk. 5.14. and ordinarly keeped the festivall times at Jerusalem: why should he not also have entered his Ministry in the age of 30. years, according to the Leviticall Law, which he exactly observed, as he did the Morall Law?

Gregorie the great, commenting upon Ezc.

1.11.

1. 11. affirmeth, that both John Baptiſt, and Chriſt himſelf, did enter their Miniſtery in the 30. year of their age, which is alſo approven by *Polanus*, and confirmed by *Jeromes* Teſtimony, writing upon Ezech. 1.

Spanhemius addeth further, that the word ἀρχόμενος joined to any other verb, is obſerved by the learned to be redundant as in this ſame chap. v. 8. and Act. 1. 1. unto the which I anſwer, that it is not materiall, whither, in the former places, it be redundant or not, for the true ſenſe alwayes holdeth, if it be redundant, then, it being laid aſide, the reading might be in this manner. *And Jeſus himſelf was about 30. years of age.*

At length *Spanhemius* ſetteth down his own opinion, with his reaſones thereof, which is, that the number of 30. is to be taken largely, and indefinitely, and not ſtrictly and preciſely: As if *Luke* ſhould ſay, that Chriſt when he entered his calling, was about 30. years of age, ſo whether he was more or leſſe then 30. years, *Lukes* ſpeach conſidered in it ſelf, muſt be true. And he intendeth to prove two things. 1. That *Lukes* ſpeach is largely to be taken, and not ſtrictly. 2. That it importeth rather an

exceſſe then defect, and that Chriſt was then, rather more, then leſſe then 30. years. For the firſt, he bringeth four reaſons.

1. Becauſe if it be ſtrictly taken, the count can never be reconciled with the character, ſet down by *Mathew*, to wit, that Chriſt was born in the dayes of *Herode*, as may be evident by thoſe things which were diſputed by him before. He noteth, as appeareth, his ſecond doubt, where he concludeth, that the year of Chriſts birth cannot be gathered from the Periode of *Herods* reign, mentioned in the Goſpel.

Anſwer, the reconciliation of the one to the other, is eaſie: For we acknowledge, with the Scripture, that Chriſt was born in the dayes of Herod: But we gather not the year of Chriſts Birth from any particular year of *Herods* reign, which is not at all expreſſed in Scripture.

2. He alleadgeth, that in this Text, the ſpeach is not directly anent the age of Chriſt, and the exact ſupputation thereof, but only by the way, and without the place of this Argument.

This is as eaſily denyed as it is affirmed: For

For there is no other part of Scripture in the which the age of Christ, when he was baptized and installed in his ministery, could be more conveniently set down, then where both those are related together.

It is questionlesse the most fit place of all others, for that purpose: Neither can any good reason be given, why it should be set down heer, only by the way, and not mentioned again in any other place.

This I do further affirm, that the holy Ghost is most excellent in setting down of this year of Christs Baptisme, by reason of the concurrence of the circumstances, all of them most worthy to be remarked, to wit, Christs Baptisme, the comming down of the Holy Ghost upon him, and his entry into his ministery, and therefore in the beginning of the Chapter, the first whole two verses are spent in describing of this time, and in particular, the 15. year of the Emperour *Tiberius* is mentioned, and the Priesthood of *Annas* and *Cajaphas*, concurring with the former year. In the which *John* Baptist first entered his ministery, being half a year elder then our Saviour, as is manifest

nifeſt by the text, from Luk 1. 24. to 37. For this cauſe, in all the four Goſpels, the calling of Chriſt unto his miniſtery, is forthwith ſubjoined, after the calling of *John* Baptiſt.

Spanhemius his third reaſon is, becauſe (as he affirmeth) *Luke* often uſeth the round number for the broken, whereby a whole decade is often expreſſed in Scripture, and that may be called 30. 40. 50. 100. which either draweth near to that number, or a little exceedeth it. So he may be ſaid to be of 30. years of age, according to the uſe of Scripture, who exceedeth 25. and hath not attained to 34. or 35.

For anſwer, S. *Luke* never uſeth a round number, ſuch as is 20. 30. 40. 50. for a broken number. He ſhould therefore have ſet down the particular places, where *Luke* uſeth that ſort of numbering. Upon the contrare, I will give in diverſe inſtances, where *Luke*, notwithſtanding that he might have ſet down the round number for the broken, yet is ſo accurat in numbering, that he addeth either the broken number it ſelf, or then ſome other words deſigning the ſame. See

Luke

Luke 2. 37. Act. 18. 11. c. 27. 37. in ſundry other places the ods are not particularly expreſſed, but generally deſigned as Acts 4. 22. c. 5. 7. c. 23. 13. c. 25. 6. and diverſe other Scriptures.

2. Thoſe rules muſt be obſerved in rotundation of numbers, whereby times are deſigned. 1. No rotundation is to be acknowledged, unleſſe the ſame can be proven, either by circumſtances from the Text it ſelf, or by ſome other Scripture, or by reaſon. For if we ſhould faine rotundation of numbers according to our pleaſure, without reſpect of the former rule, then their ſhould be no certainty in Chronologie, but the whole frame of it ſhould be overturned. 2. In a greater number, there is to be found the greater ods, as Judg. 11. 26. 300. are put for 305. See *Junius* his annot. Gal. 3. 17. It is ſaid, that the Law was given out 430. years after the confirmation of the Covenant: Now theſe 430. years ended at the peoples removeall out of Egypt, Exod. 12. They are therefore put for 46. dayes more, Exod. 19. 1. Again a ſmaller number hath ſmaller ods, either in defect or exceſſe, as

2 Sam.

2 Sam. 5. 5. it is said that *David* did reigne over Jerusalem and Judah 33. years, where 33, are put for 32. and an half. The like is Act. 13. 18. whereof I have spoken already in the same Section. Now that in numbering of years, 20, 30, or 40. being so small a number, should be put for 1, 2, 3, or 4. in defect, or as many in excesse, is without example, to my knowledge, either in the Old or New Testament.

By due consideration of the premises, his last argument is easily answered, which he taketh from the use of the particle ὡσει, which (saith he) never determineth a thing in Scripture, when it is prefixed to numbers, but only noteth an approaching either in excesse or defect unto that number which is mentioned. I answer, there is an approaching by a greater distance, or lesse. He hath mistaken the greater distance, which ὡσει never designeth, for the lesse which it designeth.

The second thing that *Spanhemius* did undertake to prove, is, that rather an excesse nor defect is here noted, or that CHRIST was rather without nor within 30. yeares, which, he saith, is manifest by the things

that by him were disputed before, to wit, that CHRIST was born before the 43. Julian year.

For answer, the truth of Scripture may not be infringed, for making an agreement with exotick accounts of Heathens. But what if in this also *Spanhemius* come short? Let it be granted that CHRIST was born in the 42. Julian year, which is a year before the time mentioned by *Spanhemius*. The same is the 42. year of *Augustus*, reckoning his beginning from the first year of his conjunct Consulship with *Antonius*. This is estimat, by the most part, both of Chronologues and Theologues, to be the birth year of CHRIST. Adde unto those other 14. years, in whole 46. which was the full time of the reign of *Augustus*: unto the which must be further added 15. years of the reigne of *Tiberius*, who succeeded to *Augustus*, in the which year *John* began to preach, which was also the 30. year of CHRISTS age, wherein he was both baptized and installed in his calling, as hath been proven already.

From this year, if we reckon backward *inclusivè*

clusivè, Christs birth shall fall exactly in the 42. 1. *Julian* year, and so it shall be before the 43. whereby it may evidently enough appear that Christ was baptized neither before nor after the 30. year of his age, but within it, and the reckoning by the *Julian* year nothing helpeth *Spanhemius*. What I have maintained, is greatly confirmed by thatwhich is spoken, Dan. 9. 27. concerning the week in the which the Covenant should be confirmed with many, whereof I am to speak hereafter. I end then with this, that their is no appearance in Scripture that Christ was baptized either before or after the 30. year of his age, but in the same, which is the minde of the most part both of Divines and Chronologues, from the which I cannot dissent, untill I see better reasons then hitherto hath been produced.

Question twelfth.

How many years Christ lived upon earth, how long he preached, and in what year of his age he was put to death.

IT is most commonly holden by the most part that our Saviour lived only 33. years

upon earth, and that as he was baptized in the 15. year of *Tiberius*, even ſo he ended his life in the 18. year, which I eſteeme to be the truth: Howbeit it be oppoſed by diverſe of no ſmall note, but with ſmall reaſon.

For proving the former concluſion, I will ſet down certaine arguments, whereby the ſame may be ſufficiently confirmed: The firſt I take from the courſes of the two high Prieſts *Annas* and *Cajaphas*, who in the latter time of Chriſts age ſerved in there yearly courſe alternatively, as I touched before ſomewhat in the former ſection, which is manifeſt by Joh. 11. 49. and 18. 13. *Cajaphas* was high Prieſt that ſame yeare that Chriſt was put to death, and the next year afeer *Annas*. Act. 4. 6. The other yeare then before Chriſts death if we count backward *Annas* was high Prieſt, and againe *Cajaphas* next before him in the third year, and thereafter *Annas* in the fourth year which was the year of Chriſts baptiſme, and therefore *Annas* is preponed unto *Cajaphas*, Luk. 3. 2. where both are named. This I take to be an infallible argument, proving that Chriſt lived but three years after the year of his baptiſme.

The

The second reason I take from the Paschal Lamb, Exod. 12. which of all others was a most vive Type of Christ. The Paschal Lamb was ordeined to bee set apart upon the tenth day of the first moneth, and to be killed upon the 14. day in the evening. Now between the 10. and 14. are only three naturall dayes. And whereas the Paschal Lamb is commanded to be killed in the evening of the 14. day, we must ever remember, that the Jewish day began at the evening of the night preceding the same, and at the end of the former day: So the passeover was killed at the evening, at the which the 13. day day ended, and the 14. day began. Those 3. dayes interveining betwixt the tenth and 14 in the which the Paschal Lamb was set apart before it was killed, did prefigure the three years, in the which Christ was set apart for his publick Ministerie, before he was put to death. This argument must be valide: For it is not taken from a common or generall type, but from a proper and peculiar type destinate for that same end, every day being answerable to a year after the Propheticall manner of Scripture: For what other thing could be prefigured thereby?

The

The third reaſon I take from Dan. 9. 27. where it is ſaid: That he ſhall confirme the Covenant with many for one week: and in the midſt of the week he ſhall cauſe the Sacrifice and Oblation to ceaſe. Now howbeit the whole week be mentioned, yet the Covenant was onely confirmed in the latter part thereof, beginning at the midſt, to wit, 3. years and a half before the death of Chriſt, and ending thereat. It was confirmed by the coming downe of the Holy Ghoſt upon Chriſt, and by the voice from Heaven, whereby he was inſtalled in his Miniſtrie, by his baptiſme, by his preaching and miracles, by his inſtitution of the Lords Supper, which expreſly is called the New Covenant or Teſtament, and laſtly by his death. Unto this agreeth *Bullinger*, *Beroaldus*, *H. Brughton* and *Willet*, who think that Chriſt was baptized in the ſeventh moneth of his 30. year. And it is altogether moſt like that at the feaſt of tabernacles being in that moneth, *John* took a ſpeciall occaſion, through the concurſe of people, both to preach and baptize.

The Miniſterie of Chriſt was twofold, either private or publike, his private Miniſterie

rie he performed in the Synagogues of Nazareth and Capernaum, Luk. 4. 16. and 31. *&c.* between the time of his baptism and the next Pasche following, at which time coming to Jerusalem, Joh. 2. 13. he entered publikely into the temple and drove out the buyers and sellers, *&c.* From this Pasche, at the which he entered into his publike Ministerie, unto his death, there passed only three years, which with the former half year maketh out *Daniels* half week, very fitly agreeing to the present purpose.

The fifth reason, is from the four Paschs that followed the year of Christs baptisme, and his ministerie, before he shew himself publikely at Jerusalem, which are exactly set down by S. John. The first is Joh. 2. 13. The second, John 5. 1. where the Pasche is not expressly mentioned, but onely a feast of the Jews, at the which Jesus went up to Jerusalem, and it is so stiled by way of excellencie, as saith *Beza.* Some think this feast to have been the Pentecost, but they are confuted by that which is written before c. 4. 35. Say not ye there are four moneths, and then cometh harvest? Those words demonstrate the

the Paſche and not the Pentecoſt. For the Jewiſh harveſt did begin at the Paſche, and the Pentecoſt was 50. dayes thereafter. The third Paſſeover is mentioned, Ioh. 6. 4. neither needeth it ſeeme ſtrange that thoſe Paſſeovers are ſet down ſo near on to another, ſince many things that come to paſſe in the interveining time, are omitted by S. Iohn, and related in the other Goſpels. The fourth and laſt Paſſeover is expreſſely mentioned by all the foure Evangeliſts, as moſt remarkable above all the reſt. Betwixt the firſt of thoſe, at the which Chriſt entered his publike Miniſterie, and the laſt, when he ſuffered, there paſſed exactly three years. Hereby it is ſufficiently evicted, that our Saviour lived onely thirtie three years and a half upon earth, and that of thoſe, he ſpent three years and a half, in his Miniſterie private and publike.

Scaliger maintaining that Chriſt was baptized in the beginning of the 31. year of his age, and that he lived five years thereafter, addeth unto the former four Paſches, another which he collecteth from Matth. 12. 1. and Luke 6. 1. where it is acknowledged by the learned, that a feaſt of the Iewes is noted, and

is

is most like to be the Passeover. I have already made it good, I trust, that Christ was baptized in no other year of his age but the 30. As for those places that *Scalliger* citeth for making out of the fifth Passeover, It seemeth to bee no other then that which is mentioned Ioh. 5. 1. as the Iesuite Pererius observeth, when after the Pasche the Apostles pulled the ears of the corne, which may bee the reason, why Iohn passeth over in silence, all that was done betweene the second and third Pasche, which immediatly is subjoyned c. 6. 4. because the other Evangelists set down at large what happened between those two Passches, Mat. c. 12. to 13. Mark from c. 2. to the 6. Luk. from 6. to 9. If five Passeovers could have been assigned out of one and the same Evangelist, then *Scaliger* had said somthing: but of diverse Evangelists, who do not follow the same order of time, the number cannot be so certainly gathered. So *Willet*. by due consideration of the things that I have briefly set down anent this subject, it shall be easie to confute the errours of others, howbeit in particular I meddle not with them.

Question

Queſtion thirteenth.

That Chriſt was borne at the Paſche, and neither in September nor December.

CONcerning the time and ſeaſon of the yeare in the which Chriſt was borne, there are ſpecially three opinions. The firſt is of ſome, both ancients and recents, maintaining that our Saviour was borne in the ſpring time of the year, but they cannot determine in particular the moneth in the which he was borne. The ſecond opinion is ſet downe by *Beroaldus*, whom *Scaliger* and *Willet* followeth, holding that he was born in September. The third is of the Romiſh Kirk, following ſome of the ancients, maintaining Chriſts nativitie to have befallen upon the 25. day of December.

The firſt of the opinions I imbrace, that Chriſt was either born at the Paſche, or then very near to the ſame. For evidencing whereof, I will propone diverſe reaſons. The firſt I take from Luk. 2. 41. 42. where it is written that Chriſt was twelve years old at that paſſeover, at the which his parents went

went with him to Jerusalem, and he disputed with the Doctors in the Temple. Now if Christ was twelve years old at this Pasche, it importeth necessarly, that he was borne at that time of the year, otherwise how could he be said to have beene twelve years of age at that Passeover?

If it be objected, that in Scripture, the whole year is diverse times put for a broken year, and therefore the argument cannot necessarly hold. I do indeed acknowledge it to be so, but we may not imagine that a whole year is but a broken year, unlesse the same can bee demonstrate either by Text or Scripture, or by sufficient reason, as is observable sometimes in the Old Testament, but seldome in the Gospel. Otherwise, if wee shall faine whole or broken years without sufficient ground from Scripture or good reason, we shall draw the whole Chronologicall numbers, under a great uncertaintie, and they shall serve for no use. From hence it is manifest, that our Saviour was borne neither in September nor December; If he had beene borne in September, that had been half a year either before or after the Pasche, and his coming

coming to Jeruſalem being twelve years of age, would not be deſigned by the Paſſeover, but by the feaſt of Tabernacles, which was celebrate in the moneth of September. If he had been born in December in winter, his nativitie ſhould have been either 3. moneths before the Paſſeover, or then nine after the ſame, and his coming to Jeruſalem, together with his age, would be deſigned by the feaſt of Dedication inſtituted by *Judas Maccabeus*, Macab. 1. 4. 59. at the which Chriſt was preſent, Joh. 10. 22. which was celebrate in the moneth Ciſlew, in part anſwering to the moneth of December.

The ſecond argument I take from Dan. 9. 24. The words are thoſe, ſeventie weeks are determined upon thy people, *&c.* The Hebrew word ſignifieth (are cut out, or cut off) as all the beſt interpreters acknowledge. And M^r. *Lively* an Engliſh Chronologer (whom *Rivet* commenting upon Hoſea, calleth a very learned man) affirmeth that the verbe of the ſingular nnmber being put to a word of the plurall, ſhoweth that every one of the weeks from the firſt to the laſt ſhall be preciſely and abſolutely compleat. The ſame

is

affirmed by *Polanus* on Dan. 9. whom before I cited in the fourth queſt.

Of the which it followeth neceſſarly, that each one of thoſe weeks, and every year from the firſt to the laſt, beginneth and endeth at one and the ſame ſeaſon of the year, to wit, at the Paſche. So the revelation of this prophecie at the which they begun, was made to Daniel, at the Paſche, and our Saviours birth was alſo at that time, by reaſon that thoſe weeks end at the death of Chriſt, which was at the Paſſeover.

Otherwiſe, how can it be ſaid that they are preciſely cut out in particular? I have already demonſtrate this preciſe cutting out in the three laſt years of Chriſts age, by the annuarie courſes of the high Prieſts and the four Paſſeovers. The like of this preciſe reckoning we have, Exod. 12. 41. *&c.* and v. 51. where it is twice mentioned, that at the end of 430. years, to wit from the promiſe given to *Abraham*, even the ſelf ſame day, it came to paſſe, that all the hoſt of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt, which was accompliſhed alſo at the firſt Paſſeover.

3. If we will reaſon from probabilities, the

the time of the paſſeover muſt without comparison be preferred. It is very unlike, that the time of Chriſts nativity ſhould fall either in *September* in the harveſt, or in *December* in the winter: our Saviour was born at that time when the Roman Empire was taxed. Luk. 2. both men and women muſt then take journey to the chief city of their Tribe, or kindred, for that purpoſe, which muſt be underſtood to have been done not only by the Jewes, but alſo by all others within the Roman Dominions, Luk. 2. 1. Now it is moſt unlike, that *Auguſtus* being a wiſe Emperour, and the Senate of Rome ſo wiſe a Senate, would indict this taxing to bee in *December*, when the day is ſhorteſt, the way moſt unfite for travell, the air moſt intemperate through cold rain, ſnow, ſtormes, and froſts: and both men and women ſhould travell, many of them, long journeyes to the principall City of their kindred or Tribe, to be taxed at ſo inconvenient a ſeaſon.

Likewiſe, it is no leſſe unapparent, that this taxe ſhould be in *September*, when the harveſt being in many parts of the Roman Empire, both men and women muſt leave there

their labour, that they might take journey to the places in the which they must be taxed. Upon the contrare, the time of the Jewish passeover, answering to the end of our *March*, was free of all the former inconvenients, the day being of equall length, the air temperate and free of storms, and the common wayes easily passible, and in Judea, the harvest yet scarce beginning.

At what time could the Son of God more conveniently come in the world, then at that time, which was so remarkable both to Jews and Gentiles? Unto both because of the common taxe imposed upon the whole Roman Empire, but especially unto the Jewes, by reason of the celebration of the passeover at that time, which *Scaliger* saith, was the head of all other festivities, ἢ τάξει, ἢ τιμῇ both for order and honour, L. 6. *de emendat temp.* and Exod. 12. 42. according to the Originall, is called a night of observations, to be keeped by the children of Israel thorow their generations, and c. 13. 9. which should be unto them a signe upon their hands, and for a remembrance between their eyes. By all those and diverse other circumstances, the

the preheminence of this feſtivitie, is noted beyond all others.

The Lord is not tyed unto times and ſeaſons, but according to his moſt free will worketh his own works when it pleaſeth him: yet herein he applyeth himſelf to our infirmity, and for helping of our memorie, he uſeth to caſt thoſe works, which he would have us eſpecially to remember in that time which is alſo notable by other illuſtrious events. *Polan.* on Dan. 9. v. 1. This may be eaſily demonſtrate by manifold examples from Scripture.

4. But the fourth reaſon is a great deal more effectuall.

Bullinger, *Beroaldus*, *H. Brughton*, and *Willet* acknowledge, and that truely, that the half of the week, mentioned Dan. 9. 27. in the whicd the Covenant ſhould be confirmed, and the dayly ſacrifice cauſed to ceaſe, had the beginning thereof, at Chriſts baptiſme and entrie to his Miniſterie, which they affirme to have been in Tiſhrie, which is the ſeventh moneth, and of neceſſitie it muſt be ſo, for the half week, being the latter half of the laſt week of the ſeventie, which endeth at Chriſts death, then by reckoning backward three

three years and a half, the beginning of the half week ſhall fall directly at the midpart of the 30. year of Chriſts age, which muſt be in the ſeventh moneth, agreeable to the reckoning in the former two queſtions. For if Chriſt had been Baptized in the 30 year of his age, then there would have been half a year more then the half week: And if he had been Baptized at the end of his 30. year. then there ſhould have been half a year leſſe. So the counting by the half week, maketh his Baptiſme to fall in the midſt of his 30. year, which being in September, half a year before the next Paſſeover, at the which our SAVIOUR was 30. years compleet, then it followeth conveniently that he was born at the Paſſeover. *Beroaldus* uſeth the ſame reaſon taken from the half week to proveChriſts birth to have been in September: But to any man who duely conſidereth, it will hereby appear, that CHRISTS Nativitie was at the Paſche, and not in September.

I dare not confidently ſay of CHRIST that which *Bodinus* writeth of *Petrarch*, and the Jews of *Moſes*, that both were born upon the ſame day of the yeare upon the which

they died: And yet I will not diſſemble, that I think it more like to have been ſo, and further, that He was born in the Evening, at the very time of the eating of the Paſſover: For immediatly thereafter, in the night, the Angel of the LORD gave notice thereof to the Shepherds that were watching their flocks, Luk. 2. 8. Before I go foreward, other two Reaſons muſt be anſwered, which *Beroaldus* bringeth for to prove CHRIST's Nativity to have been in the ſeventh moneth. The firſt he taketh from the cuſtome of the Grecians and Ægyptians, who, in memory of CHRIST's birth, began their year in September, and from the beginning of the Imperiall Indiction at that time alſo.

To this Reaſon M. *Lively* anſwereth: That the Grecians and Egyptians began their year in September, in remembrance of *Alexanders* victory againſt *Darius*: and the Imperiall Indiction began then, becauſe *Conſtantine* then began his reigne.

His other Reaſon, which is alſo preſſed by *Scaliger*, is this. There were 24. courſes of the Prieſts, 1 Chron. 24. who ſerved every moneth by couples. *Abiahs* courſe, of the which

which was *Zacharias*, was the eighth single course, 1Chr.24.10. and the fourth double. Those courses began in March. Then *Abiahs* course fell out to be in June, the fourth moneth. Immediatly after, was *John Baptist* conceived, and six moneths after our Blessed SAVIOUR, as may be gathered from Luke 1. 26. 36. *John*, being then conceived in June, must be born 9. moneths after, to wit, in March, and our SAVIOUR must be conceived in December, and then His Birth will fall out in the ninth moneth after, namely September.

1. For answer: *Beroaldus* is deceived in alledging that the courses or classes of the Priests served only by couples every moneth, that is each course two weeks. For *Scaliger* proveth out of *Josephus* and the Liturgies of the Jews that they served weekly, and that every course did begin their task upon the Sabbath in the morning, which may appear also to be true, by comparing 1Chron. 25.9. with 2Chron. 23.4.

2. But this Reason is as weak as the other. If there had been 52. courses, that is, one for every week in the year, or 26. that is,

one for every week in the half year, which ſhould have gone about in a conſtant order: Then there might have been ſome ſurer Argument collected from *John Baptiſts* conception and nativity. But it muſt be conſidered that thoſe courſes of the Prieſts keeped no conſtant and ſet time in the year. All thoſe 24. courſes went about twice in the year, and four of them muſt go about thrice, to make out the ſervice of 52. weeks, which are a compleat year. If then it be queſtioned, whether at the firſt, ſecond or third circuit the Angel appeared unto *Zacharias*, the father of *John Baptiſt*, and his wife *Elizabeth* thereafter conceived? I ſuſpect that this queſtion is ſo difficile, that it muſt be only anſwered by ſilence: yea it is manifeſt, that thoſe courſes, from the beginning, never keeped a conſtant time, but each one of them ſerved, ſometime in the Spring, ſometime in Sommer, Harveſt or Winter, as it befell them, ſo that no ſound Reaſon can be taken from their courſes.

5. Having ended with *Beroaldus*, I ſubjoin the fifth and laſt Reaſon, taken from probability and likelyhood. A great many of

of the moſt remarkable things, which befell from the Creation even to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, are found to have come to paſſe in the Spring time of the year, and eſpecially in the firſt moneth, in the which the Paſſeover was celebrat. The particulars, which I give in, are thoſe. 1. In that moneth the World was created, as hath been ſhown in the firſt Period. 2. In it the World was renewed after the floud, in the dayes of *Noah*, Gen. 8. 13. In this moneth *Abraham* left Ur of Chaldea: and (as is moſt probable) upon that ſame day of the moneth, on the which the Paſſeover was thereafter inſtitute, as hath been ſhown before.

4. In this moneth, the people of Iſrael were delivered from the ſlavery of the Ægyptians, their enemies were drowned in the Red Sea, and ſhortly thereafter the Law was given out at Mount Sinai.

5. Upon the firſt day of this moneth the Tabernacle was erected, and the Ark of the Teſtimony put therein, Exod. 40. 2, 3.

6. *Aaron* and his ſons were conſecrat for the Eccleſiaſtick Miniſtry, Lev. 8. Numb. 1. 1. in the 13. thereof the Levites were al-

ſo conſecrat, Numb. 7. v. 78. c. 9. 1, 2, *&c.*

7. Upon the tenth day thereof, the people paſſed through the River Jordan, and entred the Land of Canaan, Joſh. 4. 9.

8. In it, was the Commandement anent Circumciſion renewed. The firſt Paſſeover keeped in the Land of Canaan, and the Manna ceaſed, Joſ. 5. and Jericho taken, Joſ. 6.

9. In it alſo *Ezekiah* began both his reign, and Solemn Reformation of Religion, 2 Chr. 29.

10. In this moneth, was that famous Paſſeover keeped by *Joſia*, which I mention, becauſe it is moſt ſingularly remarked in Scripture, 2 Chron. 23. 21, 22.

11. In it the Prophecy of the 70. weeks was revealed unto *Daniel*, the Babyloniſh Impire overthrown, the Perſian Impire erected, and (together with the Jewes) many other Nations ſet at liberty: for all theſe things did concurre. See what is ſet down before in the ſecond Reaſon.

12. In it alſo *Ezra* and his companions returned from Babylon, Ezra 7. 9. and c. 8. and *Nehemiah* returned to Jeruſalem for repairing the walls thereof, Neh. 2. 1.

13. In

13. In this moneth, was *Daniels* laſt viſion manifeſted unto him, Dan. 10. 4. containing in it diverſe things, which ſerveth for underſtanding of the Prophecie of the 70. weeks

4. In it was Ezechiels laſt and moſt ſublime viſions made known unto him anent the reſtoring of the City and Temple, Ezec. 40. 1

15. In this moneth CHRIST Diſputed with the Doctoures of the Law at Jeruſalem.

16. In it alſo did he enter his publick Miniſtery.

17. In it he was put to death.

18. In the ſame moneth, Jeruſalem was beſieged by *Titus*. Finally in it the great Periode of time, from the creation to the death of CHRIST, did both begin and end, as alſo every one of the ſeven principall parts thereof had their beginning and end thereat, onely the firſt excepted, which notwithſtanding, beginneth *excluſivè* thereat, and the beginning of the ſixth is alſo to be excepted. The eight following not ſet down in Scripture, I mean the end thereof, to wit, the time betwixt Chriſts death and the overthrow of Jeruſalem, hath the ſame beginning and end. All which things being of ſo ſingular

gular note, may give us to apprehend, that ſome eminent reſpect hath been given by the Deitie to this moneth, beyond any other moneth in the year, and therefore, we may juſtly think, that it was honoured by the birth of the Son of God, as it was alſo thereafter by his death.

Unto the premiſſes, I will onely adde that which *Scaliger* hath ſet down, *præfat.* in *Euſeb.* All the Ancients (ſaith he) gave great honour to the 25. of March, upon the which they thought the world was made, CHSIRT was Conceived, and put to death. They failed not in judging that the world was created at that ſeaſon of the year, and Chriſt put to death. But they have miſtaken the time of of his Conception for the time of his Birth, and whatſoever they have ſaid anent the time of Chriſts Conception and Birth, moſt apparently agreeth to John Baptiſt *& contrà.* Chriſt was conceived at the Summer Solſtice, and born at the vernall Equinox. John was conceived at the vernall Equinox, and born at the Winter Solſtice, in December, half a year before our SAVIOUR, as appeareth Luk. 1. Neither

ther needeth it to seem strange that the Ancients should have failed in this, since for the space of 400. years after Christ, his nativitie was not determined unto the 25. of December: *Ambrose* is the first man that maketh mention thereof, and it seemeth that they have onely guessed thereat.

Question fourteenth.

He shall confirme the Covenant for one week with many: How this week is rightly to be marched.

HOwbeit by the things that before hath been delivered, it may be understood how the last week of the 70. should be fixed, yet I will adde a little further for clearing of the same.

Some do refer this last week unto the last seven years, which immediatly did go before the destruction of the City. *Jun.* and *Polan.* But it is sufficiently shewed before, Sect. 7. that those weeks must expire in the death of the MESSIAH, and are not to be stretched beyond the same.

Some begin the last week at the Baptisme of

of Chriſt, and end it three years and an half after his death, as *Melanchton*, *Junius* edit. 1. *Pintus*, &c. But ſeeing it is ſaid he ſhall confirm the Covenant for one week (he) that is, the MESSIAH, the Covenant muſt be confirmed before the MESSIAH be ſlain. For otherwiſe, how ſhould it appear that it was confirmed by the MESSIAH. If it were not done in his time, that is in the dayes of his fleſh: he then muſt confirm it either before, or at his death before he be taken out of the way. For otherwiſe, it ſhould not be manifeſt, and apparent to be the MESSIAHS work. This laſt week then, muſt begin where the 62. weeks end, that is, ſeven years before the death of Chriſt. The firſt half year went before his Baptiſme, as a preparative by the Miniſterie of John Baptiſt, then in the latter half week, thoſe things were performed, as the next words ſhow, the whole week is named, becauſe thoſe things were done in the laſt week, but not in all the week, onely on the latter part thereof. For they were not done in the beginning of the week, but in the latter three years and a half, to wit in the 15. year of Tiberius, after John had begun

begun to Preach, and CHRIST was Baptized, *&c.*

See the former Section at the fourth Reason.

Question fifteenth.

Upon what day of the week Christ suffered, and whether on a festivall day or not?

Josephus Scaliger, of worthy memory, is of that minde, that Christ did eat the Passeover in the evening of the sixth day, and the day following, which was a part thereof, he suffered.

That which *Scaliger* saith is agreeable to the truth, save that he faileth, in not rightly distinguishing the time of the Day at the which Christ suffered, as I conceive, the truth is, that Christ died both on a festivall day, and on the sixth day of the week. He was put to death on a festivall day, to wit, the 14. day of the moneth, which according to the Law, was the day of the Passover, that the body or verity might answer unto the figure or shaddow: This day was no other but the 6. day of the week, answerable to our Fryday. For it was the day immediatly

diatly preceeding the Jewiſh ſabbath, as is manifeſt by the Hiſtory of the Goſpel. The time of the day in the which Chriſt ſuffered, was before the time of the evening Sacrifice, between the *6.* and *9.* houres, Luk. 23. 44. compared with Mat: 27. 45, 46. The which time did anſwer unto the ſpace between the 12. houre of the day unto us, and the third houre afternoon. The time when CHRIST did eat the Paſſover, was in the evening before the 14. day, to wit, between the ſetting of the ſun in the 13. day, and the cloſing of day-light following, which was the beginning of the Jewiſh day, Gen. 1. 5. and is called the two evenings, Exod. 12. *6.* whereof I am ſhortly to ſpeak.

D. Willet, oppoſeth himſelf againſt *Scaliger*, but in doing of the ſame he faileth diverſe wayes. 1. In that he taketh the ſpace between the two evenings, to have been in the end of the 14. day. But neither could that be, neither yet was it *Scaligers* meaning. Our Saviour could not eat the Paſſover in the end of the 14. day. For he was aprehended the night before, and put to death, between the ſixth and ninth houre, upon the

14. day as hath been said, 2. *Scaliger* is of that minde, that CHRIST did eat the Passeover in the evening before the sixth day, and not in the end of it.

Willets second fail is, that he reckoneth the 14. day of the moneth, on the which Christ suffered, to have been the fifth day of the week, and the day following to have been the sixth day, but that cannot be: For then our Saviour should have lyen in the grave the sixth day, and risen upon the seventh, which was the Jewish sabbath, and last day of the week, contrare to the History of the passion wherein is declared that he rose upon the first day of the week.

I come next to the examination of *Scaligers* opinion, concerning the particular time of the day, when the Passeover was sacrificed. in his 6. book of Emend. of times, he rightly distinguisheth the evening of the Jewish civil day, the one from the evening oblation, and the other from the going down of the Sun, But herein he faileth, that he maketh the time of the sacrificing of the Passover, to have been one and the same with the time of the dayly evening sacrifice, which was at the

the end of the day, the 9. and 12. houre, when the Sun did ſet, which he would prove by the Teſtimony of *Joſephus*. But *Joſephus* his Teſtimony can not be ſufficient. For if at that time the Iews did fail in the day it ſelf, that is, in offering the Paſſover upon the 15. day, whereas they ſhould have offered the ſame according to the Law, upon the 14. as our Saviour himſelf, and his Apoſtles did, then it may juſtly be thought, that they might erre in the particular time of the day alſo, and have miſſed the ſame, or then, that *Joſephus*, as he faileth in diverſe other things, hath alſo failed in this.

I know, that likewiſe other men of ſingular learning, as *Junius*, and *Beza*, are almoſt of that ſame minde with *Scaliger*: The difference is this, *Beza*. Annot. on Mat. 26. 17. ſetteth the two evenings in the latter end of the 14. day, as doth *Junius* alſo: But that cannot be, for before that time Chriſt was crucified; *Scaliger* ſetteth them at the evening Sacrifice of the 13. day. But I profeſſe that I cannot agree, either to the one or the other.

Both the daily ſacrifice and the Paſſeover were

were ordained to be offered *inter duas veſperas*, between the two evenings. But thoſe two evenings I take to be diverſe. The two evenings, between the which the daily evening ſacrifice was offered, I think indeed to have been at the end of the day, between the ninth houre, when the day beginneth greatly to decline, and the twelfth houre, when the Sun ſetteth. But the two evenings, in the which the Paſſeover was offered, appeareth rather to have been at the beginning of the day, to wit, between the ſetting of the Sun, at the which the Jewiſh civil day began, and the cloſing of the day-light following. Thoſe two evenings are called by ſome, *occaſus corporis*, and *occaſus lucis*. This opinion hath moſt prevailed with me, for theſe ſubſequent Reaſons, which I propound to bee conſidered.

1. The Jews did eat the Paſſeover in the night before their coming out of Egypt, Exod. 12. But if they had eaten the ſame between the ninth and twelfth houre of the day preceeding, then they had not done according to the Law, whereby the Paſſeover was ordained to be celebrat upon the 14. day,

and

and not upon the 13. day preceeding. Therefore the two evenings, betwixt the which they did eat the Passeover, were the setting of the Sun at the 12. houre of the 13. day going before, at the which time began the 14. day, and the closing of the day light thereafter.

2. The circumstances of the Text, Deut. 16. 6, *&c.* proveth the same. The words are these: *Thou shalt sacrifice the passeover at even, at the going down of the Sun, at the season that thou camest out of Egypt.* The Passeover is commanded to be sacrificed, at the going down of the Sun: but the Sun did not go down before the twelfth houre, at the which the former day ended, and the next began.

The dayly evening sacrifice is no where commanded to be offered at the going down of the Sun, but betwixt the 9. and 12. hour The differenee is manifest.

3. This is also proven by our Saviours practise, who did eat the Passeover in the evening of the 14. day, before he was apprehended, which could not be at the time of the evening Sacrifice preceeding: For then Christ

Christ had transgressed the Law in eating the Passeover upon the 13. day, which should have been eaten upon the 14. Beside this, the dayly sacrifice was offered before Supper, the Passeover after Supper.

I can not omit another challenge that *Willet* hath against *Scaliger*, for that hee holdeth that CHRIST and the Jewes did eat the Passeover both at the same instant upon the 14. day at even according to the Law. In this challenge, *Willet* hath the best part, and *Scaliger* the worst. The reasons to and froe, with the answeres thereof may be had from *Willet* himself. Quest. 37. on DAN. 9. I will here only in few words set downe the substance of that which *Willet* delivereth.

The Jewes did celebrate the Passeover that year, a day after that CHRIST celebrated the same, as is evident JOH. 18. 28. where it is said, that they themselves went not into the judgement hall, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passeover. The Jewes therefore had not then eaten it, when they brought our Saviour before Pilate, but hee with

his Apoſtles had eaten it the night before.

2. The day on the which CHRIST was put to death, is called JOH. 19. 31 the preparation, that is, the day going before the Paſſeover, in the which they did prepare themſelves for it. This the Jewes did, according to the tradition of their Rabbines, who had ordained, that if the Paſche ſhould fall upon a day next preceeding the Sabbath, it ſhould be tranſferred unto the Sabbath it ſelf. Leſt they ſhould keep two feriate dayes together, which might be troubleſome to them.

Wherefore, ſeeing that year the Paſche fell upon the ſixt day of the week, which is our fryday, they tranſlated it unto the ſeventh day following, which was the Sabbath. And for that cauſe, JOH. 19. 31. that Sabbath is called an high Day, by reaſon of the concurſe of the Paſchall feſtivitie, which, even by it ſelf alone, was to be celebrate as a Sabbath.

The

The Jubilies of the last Periode.

20.——————49. Of the Persian impire in the sixt year of *Dar. Nothus.* Ezra. 4. 15.

21.——————98. Of the Persian impire.

22.——————20. Of the Greek impire and third year of Olympiade. — 117.

23.——————69. Of the impire & fourth of Olympiade. — 129.

Jubile 24. endeth Ann. 118. Of the impire & first of Olympiade. — 143.

25.——————167. Of the impire & second of Olympiade. — 155.

26.——————216. Of the impire and second of Olympiade. — 167.

27.——————265. Of the impire and third of Olympiade.—179.

28——————14. Of the Romane impire & fourth of Olympiade. ————191.

29. and last——63. Of the Romane impire and first of Olympiade. ————203.

Which is acknowledged by *Scaliger* and *Junius* to have beene the yeare in the which Christ died.

Thus, by the Good Hand and assistance of God, through the right limiting of the seven principall Periodes of ancient time; I trust that I have made it good, that from the Creation to the death of Christ, there are only 3960. years reckoning by the equall years of the Hebrews. But neither the Julian, nor Astronomick,

o

or Tropick yeare reacheth ſo farre: For there are onely 3959. Iulian years with 2. moneths and 17. dayes, and of Aſtronomick yeares, 3959. with 33. dayes or thereby. Unto the former account I ſubjoine this admirable obſervation, that the former great Periode containeth the age of CHRIST (which is 33. yeares) a hundred and twenty times repeated. Every hundred yeare hath thrice the age of CHRIST and a year more. Unto theſe 3960. yeares, if ye ſhall adde 40. years, which are commonly holden to be the juſt time betweene the death of our Saviour and the deſtruction of Ieruſalem, then there ariſeth full 4000. yeares.

Soli DEO *gloria.*

Summa

Summa totius præcedentis Tractatus.

Condito ab orbe ad Christi obitum ter sunt tibi mille,
Et nongenti & sexaginta anni, in quibus ætas
Christi centenâ & vice vicenâ repetita est:
Vixit is integros triginta cum tribus annis.

Summa ejusdem amplior.

Periodus

1. *Mille & sexcenti quinquaginta & sex anni*
Condito ab orbe ad diluvium; hinc ad patris Abrami
Excessum è terrâ Chaldeâ quadringenti.

2. *Sunt & septem anni, quando est promissio prima*
Facta: indè ad populi egressum è Memphitide terrâ.

3. *Sunt*

3. *Sunt quadringenti cum triginta insuper annis,*
A populi egressu posita ad fundamina templi.
4. *Quadringenti octoginta, quod substitit annis,*
Inde quater centum viginti, his addito
septem
5. *Ad casum* Zedekiæ, *urbis gentisque ruinam.*
Exilium Babyloniacum duraverat annos
6. *Septenos decies ad* Cyri *tempora Regis,*
Quum populum patrias Zerobabel *duxit*
in oras.
7. *Hinc quadringenti & nonaginta insuper ann*
Decurrunt Christi ad fera fata: his si
placet adde
Quadraginta annos ad templi urbisq; ruinam,
Et quater exactos mille annos certus habebis.

Summa hepdomadum *Danielis.*

NOn Cyri *edicto*, Darî *nec ab* Hystaspidæ,
Nec Xerxis *Regis*, *nec* Longimani Artaxerxis,
Dariive Nothi, Memoris, *nec ab* Artaxerxis,
Sed Verbo à Domini, *quod vulgatum est* Gabrieli,
Incipiunt decies septem hepdomades Danielis,
Finis at in Christi morte est fingendus: Eodem

A Domini Verbo incipiunt ſeptennia ſeptem,
Dariique Nothi *ſexto clauduntur in anno,*
Anno, quo Templum eſt perfectum: Indè incipiendæ
Septuaginta duæ hepdomades, quarum exitus annis
Eſt Chriſti ante obitum ſeptem: hepdomas ultima & illa eſt
Quæ nece finitur Chriſti: ſed dimidiata
Hepdomas incipit à Chriſti baptiſmate, & exit
In morte ejuſdem, non Templi in fine nec urbis.

Nomina Majorum Chriſti, ut habentur apud Lucam, verſu

qualicunque ad juvandam memoriam deſcripta, *ut & alia quæ ſequuntur.*

ADam, Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahlael, Jared, Enoch,
Methuſalem, Lamech, Noe, Sem, Arphaxadus, *inde*
Selachus *atq;* Heber, Peleg, Rehuque Serugus,
Atq; Nahor, Thare, Abramus, *qui gignit* Iſacum,
Unde Jacob, *cujus natus de ſemine* Judas,
Hinc Phares, Eſrom, *cumq;* Aramo Aminadabus,

Et

Et Naſſon, Salmon, Booz, *cumq;* Obede Jeſſe,
Rex David, Nathan, Mattatha, Menamque
Melea,
Eliakim, Joſeph, Jonam, Juda, Simeonque,
Atq; Levi, Matthat, Jorimque, Eleezer, Joſe,
Hinc Er, *&* Elmodam, Coſam, Addi, *jungito* Melchi,
Neri, Salathiel, *&* *cum* Zorobabele Rheſa,
Atq; Joanna, Juda, Simei, *ſequitur* Mattathias,
Atq; Maath, Nagge *pater* Eſli, Nahūus, Amos
Mattathias, Joſeph, Janna, Melchique, Leviq;
Matthat, Eli, Joſeph Chriſti *pater ille putatus*.

Nomina duodecim Patriarcharum.

Maximus eſt Reuben, poſt hunc Simeonque, Levique
Crudeles fratres, queis tu fortiſsime Juda
Succedis, tibi ſed Zebulun, *atq;* Iſſachar *illi*,
Iſſacharem Bilha *ſequitur de matre creatus*
Dan, *duo Zilpiginæ, poſt hunc* Gad, *dives &*
Aſcher,
Nephthalis *ex* Bilhâ, Joſephus, Benjamin
ambo
Rachelis *nati geniti de patre* Jacobo.

Plagæ

Plagæ Ægyptiacæ.

Unda rubet, ranæque scatent, culicumque caterva,
Hinc muscæ pecudum sunt strata cadavera passim,
Vecisæ, grando, dein bruchus dente nefando,
Sol tegitur, primam mors necat invida prolem.

Nomina Judicum Israelis.

Othniel, *atque* Ehud, Samgar, *ac* Debora, Gidhon,
Abimelech, Tola, Jail, Iephte, Ibsan, & Elon,
Abdon *cum* Samsone: Eli Samuelq; *sequuntur*.

Reges Israelis & Judæ ante & post Schisma.

[1]Saul, [2]David, [3]Salomon, [4]Rehoboam, [5]Abijah,
& [6]Asa,
Filius & patri succedit [7]Josaphat Asæ
Huic [8]Joram, [9]Achazias, [10]Athalia, [11]Joash, [12]Amazia
Atque [13]Uzzia, [14]Jothamque Achaz, [15]Ezekiah, [16]Manasses, [17]Ammon,

Ammon, Josias, Joachaz, Jojakim, Ioiahin, *rex*
Zedekias *sub quo traxit gens tota ruinam.*

Regis Israelis post Schisma.

Jeroboam, Nadab, *cujus stirps tota* Baasha
Successore cadit, proles huic ebrius Elah,
Quem cædit Zimri, *septem regnatque diebus*
Huic Tibni, *ac* Omri *struxit qui Shomronis urbē*
Filius hinc Ahab *sceleratior omnibus unus*
Achaziasq; Jehoramq; Jehu, Jechoachaz,
Atq; Joash, *&* Jeroboam, Zechariaq; Shallum
Et Menahen, Pekajah, Peka, *&* *postremus* Osea
Quem sexto Assyrius Ezekiæ *depulit anno.*

Miracula *Elisha.*

Vestitu Eliæ *Jordanis dividit undas,*
Atq; undas Jerichuntinas sale salit amaras.
Vatem ridentes pueri cæduntur ab ursis.
Hinc exercitui sitienti sufficit undas

Pauperis

Pauperis [5] *inde oleum vidua augetur Shunamitis.*
Atque parit [6] *natum,* [7] *moriens idemque revivit.*
Pulmentum [8] *fit dulce, &* [9] *panes multiplicantur.*
Sanatur Naaman [10], *sed adhæret lepra* Gehazo [11].
Massa [12] *natat ferri, Syrique* [13] *arcana Tyranni*
Nota patent, Syrorum & [14] *cæcum redditur agmen.*
Copia Samariæ victus prædicitur, [15] *Inde*
Dira fames, [16] *& mors prædicitur hinc* [17] Benhadadi.
Inque Israelitas [18] *sæviſsima dextra* Hazaelis.

Reges Perſarum.

CYrus, Cambyſes, Dariuſque Hyſtaſpides
Xerxes, Longimanuſq; Nothus, Memor,
Ochus & Arſes,
Ultimus eſt horum Rex Darius Codomanus.

Reges Syriæ ſive Seleucidæ, ſucceſſores *Alexandri* Magni

M*Agnus* Alexander, Nicanor, Soter, *& inde*
Theios, Callinicuſque Leſannuſque Antiochuſque

Magnus

Magnus, patris amor, illustrisque ultimus horum.
Plures erant Seleucidæ successores Antiochi, *sed ego illos tantum nomino, qui Judæam possederunt, in quâ erat Ecclesia, quique in Prophetiâ* Danielis *monstrantur.*

Successores *Alexandri* Magni in regno Ægypti.

M*Agnus* Alexander, Lagides & Philadelphus,
Atq; bono est opere cui nomen, patris amansque
Illustrisq; hinc matris amans, his ordine subsunt
Physcon, Lathurusq; Auletes, & Cleopatra.

Sequitur Elegia Pænitentialis, scripta *Anno* 1648.

S*Umme Pater, supera me specta mitis ab arce,*
Dum pereo, errantem commiseratus ovem.
Avia per non trita, feri de fauce Leonis
Eripe me, ereptum junge tuoque gregi,
Perditus (hei mihi) sum nummus, me lampade pura,
Amissum, verbi me face, quære, tui.
Verre Domum, totam, scrutare nec impiger, edem,
Inventum loculis meque reconde tuis.

Prodigus

Prodigus (ah) ſum natus ego, qui patre relicto
Et patriâ, externi captus amore ſoli
Diſceſſi infelix, & lurco degener, aſſem
Omnem decoxi, qui mihi ſorte datur.
Hinc, quum dira fames, atq; afflixiſſet egeſtas,
Verna peregrino ſervio vilis hero,
Immundos mihi qui mandavit paſcere porcos,
Et dapis, impaſto, nil dedit illa manus.
Abjectas nemo ſiliquas porrexit egenti,
Quæ fuerant noſtro grata alimenta gregi.
Reddita ſed mihi quum mens eſſet, meq; ipſe recepi
Impatiens tuleram triſtia damna famis,
Sapè recordabar, famulis quot, in æde paternâ
Sint data munificè fercula larga manu.
Hinc ſtatui ad patrem facilemq; bonumq; reverti,
Et veniam noxis expetiiſſe meis,
Faſce gravor ſcelerum, te contrà, & ſidera contrà,
Te coram peragor, dum pater alme, reus:
Indignuſque tui ſum nati nomine, lucem
Hanc oculis ego nec cernere dignus eram.
Sim famulus tibi, ſim vilis mediaſtinus, Inde
Incola permaneam dummodo in æde tuâ.
Obvius, O genitor, venienti occurre, labellis
Et mea colla tenens, oſcula fige meis.
Eia, age, dic tegat huic ut me lectiſſima veſtis,
Hæreat & digitis lucida gemma meis,

Apten-

Aptenturq; pedum noſtris nova vincula plantis,
Hinc pedibus ne per compita nudus eam.
Jam cadat & pinguiis vitulus, cogantur amicè
Ut choreis ductis carmina feſta canant,
Geſtiat angelicuſque chorus, pæanaque dicat,
Plaudat & æther, Io terq; quaterq; ferat.
Nunc ovis amiſſa eſt invēta, nummiſma repertum
Prodigus ad patrem filius atque redit.
Jam cæcus videt, it claudus, diteſcit egenus,
Procedit rectâ jam vagus erro viâ,
Triſtis & exultat, ſanatur & æger, abundè
Paſcitur eſuriens, oraque ſicca bibunt:
Eſuriem pellunt Cæleſtis fercula mannæ,
Hauſtaque de vitæ flumina fonte ſitim:
Induitur nudus, liber qui carcere clauſus,
Liber & eſt factus qui modò ſervus erat:
Æra remittuntur, Jubilæum cornicen annum
Prædicat, & Dominis reſtituuntur agri:
Mutantur tenebræ in lucem: nitet ortus ab alto
Lucifer, & pulſâ nocte ſerena dies:
Mortuus & redit in vitam, Cæloq; renatus
Hæres aſſeritur qui Stygis ante fuit.
Quas tibi nunc grates, & quæ perſolvere dona
Pro meritis tantis, maxime Chriſte, queam,
Qui vitam renovas, impurum ſanguine puro
Expurgas, noxas abluis atque meas?

Unus

Unus concilias nobis patremque, polumque,
Tu pasci Ambrosiâ nectare das que sacro.
O ego si valeam momentum impendere vitæ
Quod superest laudi servitioque tuo,
Atque animo meliora agitans reparare ruinas
Præteriti enormes temporis ipse queam,
Ne mea de vitæ radantur nomina libro,
Sed maneam in Domini firma columna domo.
Interea lectumque gregem, sanctæque Sionis,
Alme pater, memori mænia mente tene.
Jam leo Tartareusque rugit, Romanaque sævit
Bellua, sponsæ atrox hostis uterque tuæ:
Ille, sui novit fore tempus perbreve regni:
Hujus, quotidiè vis labefacta ruit.
Tartareum vinclis domitum constringe leonem,
Et capitolinum pellito sede lupum:
Hunc face divini maledictum confice verbi,
Et sermone sacro, qui fluit ore tuo.
Vos etiam quibus est sancti custodia cœtus
Et vigil electi tradita cura gregis,
Pascendum Dominusque suum commisit ovile
Egregii mistæ Presbyterique pii,
Manibus in Solymæ nocteque die que canoram
Altisonæ vocem tollite more tubæ:
Instate assiduè, fratreque docete, monete,
Instillate animis dogmata sana piis,

Pro

Pro grege dilecto fundentes vota preceſq́,
Aque magiſtratu, principibuſq; ſimul,
Regibus atq́ unctis, faciles ut dentur quietam,
Fuſtamque & vitam degere poſſe piam:
Utq́ cadat Satanæ & regnum ſimul Antichriſti,
Qui ſedet in templo ceu Deus ipſe Dei.
Numinis ignaro illudens populoque prophano
Innumeris technis flexilibuſque ſtrophis,
Ficta & falſa ſimul miracula patrat Agyrtes,
Præſtygiis orbem faſcinat atq́ ſuis,
Se faſtu infando ſupráq́ nefarius effert.
Omne quod & colitur numē, & omne ſacrum:
Vos huic ore, animis, víq́ omni opponite monſtro,
Ut veſtrá pereat bellua voce triplex.
Voſq; paludati terreſtria numina, Reges,
Et Regum nati, magnanimique duces,
Ocyus evigilate alacres, machaque nefandæ,
Septem quæ montes & capita alta tenet,
Auro oſtroque nitens, & multis inſidet undis,
Sanguine ſanctorum nec ſatiata ſatis
Ipſa, ſed aurato cyatho Circæa propinat
Pharmaca quæ vobis, philtraque dira dedit,
Et pedibus Regum conculcat colla ſuperbis,
Regna novis dominis datq; adimitq; ſuis:
Unà incincti armis, ferrumq; ignemq; famemq;
Inferte, infandæ reddite juſta lupæ

Accepti memores, & conduplicate merenti
Supplicium, vestro vulnere cæsa cadat:
Det vestris Deus hoc aboleri dedecus armis,
Intereat vestrâ pestis & illa manu.
Iam cadit, ingentem Babylon trahit alta ruinam,
Et magis atque magis corruet illa dehinc.
Fatalis venit hora, diesque novissimus instat,
Enthea dicta sacris quem cecinere libris.
Exultate poli, atq; polo gens debita justi:
Ipse Deus vestris cladibus ultor erit.
Oppressi miserere gregis, sanctissime vindex,
Et sacrum à rapidis protege ovile lupis.
Exaudi gemitusque tuæ & lamenta columbæ,
Vulturibus ne sit præda relicta feris:
Illi pacificæ ramum prætendito olivæ,
Figat ubi trepidum fessa labore pedem.
Sit curæ Regina tibi tua regia proles,
Illa tui nati sponsa, & amica, soror,
Quam gẽteſq; premunt sævę immaneſq; tyranni,
Hostica quam terrâ vis premit atque mari.
Et fratres ficti vulpino è semine nati,
Queis color est pictus, corq; animusq; duplex
Adfer opem, fer opem tanto in discrimine rerum,
Illius & lachrymas utre reconde tuo,
Quas fundit, roseo seu terram purpuret Æos
Lumine, seu tenebris vesper obũbret humum.

Crimina

Crimina propitius noxaque remitte tuorum,
Sæviat in ſontes nec tuus uſq; furor.
Pœnitet (heu) ſcelerum, tu juſtus in omnibus actis
Es Deus, & ſcelerum nos rea turba ſumus.
In Turcas converte feros genteſque prophanas,
Fluminaque ac iræ fulmina cuncta tuæ,
Qui Chriſtum Dominum oderunt numenq; pudendis
Et violant ſannis opprobriiſque petunt.
At qui ſanguen amant, flagrantque cupidine belli
Artibus hos æquum eſt interiiſſe ſuis.
Jam nimis innocui bibit enſis ubique cruoris,
Tædeat hoſtiles cædis ubique manus.
Arbiter armorum paciſque æternè ſequeſter,
Qui fera bella cies, armaque ſæva premis.
Cladibus & pœnis tandem ſatiate tuorum
Arma fac ut ſileant terribileſque tubæ.
Ebria ſanguineo rubefacta eſt flumine tellus,
Nec locus eſt tumulis, oſſibus albet ager:
Ut ſimus in latis jacuere cadavera campis,
Intrepido ſanguen vultur & ore bibit.
Oppida cive carent, viduantur & arva colonis,
Patre dolet ſobules orba marita viro.
Abreptas pecudes, incenſas ignibus urbes
Vidimus, incultum meſſe carere ſolum,

Stupratasque nurus, juvenum lectissima bello
Corpora cæsa, sacris mista prophana simul:
Accessit bellique comes teterrima pestis
Reliquias belli depopulatque furens:
Quicquid & hostilis potuit vis effera, vel fraus
Vafra, fumus passi, meta nec ulla mali est.
Sæva tamen rursus Mars impius induit arma,
Et nova bella ciet, justa nec illa satis.
Portenta in terris metuendaque in aëre visa
In melius mores instituisse monent,
Signaque judicii divini horrenda minantur
Mox nisi sit fructus cura tulisse probos.
Eheu præteritos quot ficus culta per annos
Spe vanâ, Dominum decipit usque suum,
Fertilis & tantum foliis & flore caduco
Agricolam nullo fœnore iniqua beat.
At nunc radici est admota securis, & omnis
Cæsa cadet sterilis arbor, & igne perit.
Ventilabrum dextra secum portavit Iesus,
Areolam paleis purget ut ipse suam.
Triticeas messes capient & adorea farra
Cælica seclusis horrea Zizaneis:
Cum lolio paleas comburet at ignis inanes,
Quem sedare queat postera nulla dies.
Ipse potens hostis fastum contende superbi,
Et valido armatas robore funde manus.

Tu clypeus, turris, tu sola potentia nostra es,
Auxilium præsens, præsidiumque potens,
Tu vitæ columen, vindex, adamantina rupes,
Unica spes nostra es, noster & unus amor.
Auxilium fragilis dederit nec arundo Canopi,
Imbelli nobis Assyriusve manu.
Nobile consevit tua plantis dextra novellis
Vinetum, cujus tu bonus esto memor.
Dente astuta fero teneras vulpecula vites,
Sepibus & ruptis trux violavit aper.
Retibus & vulpes comprende & retibus apros,
Et meritas pœnas hostis uterq; luat.
Maternâ gemini fratres luctantur in alvo,
Auxilium electo da (pater alme) tuo.
Schismaticos cœtus, impuramq; hæreticorum
Colluviem, verbi perde vigore tui,
Qui Cœlo oppedunt, Christi petulanter Iësu
Et sacræ triados numina magna negant,
Plurimaque obtrudunt, atq; impia dogmata, tellus
Ut nova quotidiè monstra libyssa parit.
Opprime fædifragos, foribusq; exclude, sodales
Qui turbant variis excruciantque malis.
Omnem plantam imis radicibus erue, summi
Quam non plantavit dextra benigna patris.
En tua sit quantis ratis exagitata procellis,
Unda tumens in quam jam decumana ruit.

Evigila,

Evigila, & motos dicto compescito fluctus,
Astra lacessenti juraque pone mari.
Lamechidæ rapidis arcam quæ fluctuat undis
In stabili montis culmine stare jube,
Ut tuus in terris latè dominetur Iësus,
Festaque sanctus agat gaudia cœtus. Amen.

Ad Lectores.

HÆc scripsi fractus morbis senióq́ minatur,
Dum fera mors vitæ fila secare meæ.
Christe, potens rerum venturi conditor ævi,
Vivere da tecum, da mihi tuque mori.
Hoc ipsum pro me fratres orate fideles,
Pro vobis pariter non ego tardus ero.

BRITISH
9 JU 81
MUSEUM

Epitaphium

Epitaphium ipsius Authoris à seipso, Rhythmico carmine scriptum, idemque toti generi humano *commune*.

EST sperma primò fœtidum,
Saccus deindè sterquorum,
Novissimè esca vermium,
Fugacis umbræ somnium
Inane, ter vanissimum
Animal homo miserrimum,
Ferensque peccati jugum,
Sceleriscque vile mancipium,
Cui pœna sors est inferûm
In tempus omne posterum
Et sempiternum seculum,
CHRISTO nisi fuerit insitum,
Patrique fidat luminum,
Consorsque fiat cœlitum.
Memento te jam vividum,
Firmoque robore vegetum,
Ætate primâ floridum,
Formâque præstantissimum,
Fore mox cadaver putridum,
Expersque vitæ & sensuum,

Et in ſepulchro conditum
Illinc & hinc ſcatentium
Examina inter vermium,
Quod unicum domicilium
Eſt, omnium quod hoſpitium
Tam divitum quam pauperum,
Potentiumque Principum
Ad uſque tempus ultimum,
Diemque decretorium,
Quum ſortietur præmium
Opus ſecundum quiſque ſuum:
Nec proderit ſapientium
Sagacitas, nec fortium
Vis ulla, opeſve divitum,
Nec ampla regna Principum,
Quæ tunc redibunt in nihilum,
Fuit omnium quod initium.
Hic finis eſt mortalium,
Hic terminus viventium
Communis. En Epitaphium
Meum tuumque & omnium,
Qui ſunt ubique Gentium,
Quod mihi volo ſit additum.
Mox efferendus ad rogum
Quum fuero corpus mortuum.

FINIS.

9 JUIN
MUSEUM